

THE
NEW SEPARATION
FROM THE
CHURCH of *England*
GROUNDLESS;
BEING A
VINDICATION
OF THE
No Necessity of Altering
The COMMON-PRA^RYER:
IN ANSWER
To a late PAMPHLET, Entitled
THE
Necessity of an Alteration.

Τὴν ἑνωσιν ἀγαπᾶτε, τὰς μεισμούςς φεύγετε.

St. Ignatius ad Philadelph. Sect. 7.

L O N D O N,

Printed for W. MEARS, at the *Lamb* without
Temple-bar; and Sold by J. BETTENHAM,
at the *Crown* in *Pater-Noster-Row*. 1719.

THE
NEW YORK

CHURCH OF
THE

TRINITY

OF THE
CITY OF NEW YORK

AND
DIocese

OF THE
STATE OF NEW YORK



AND
DIocese



THE
VINDICATION
OF THE
No Necessity to Alter the
COMMON-PRAYER.



THE Author Of the *Necessity of an Alteration*, appears very formidable in his TITLE-PAGE, and promises mighty Feats against the Church of *England*: But when we come to his Performances, we find this mighty Champion, no better than a Knight-Errant.

THE first Page of the Pamphlet discovers the Wildness of the Man, and is a plain Demonstration, that whatever we meet with in the Book that carries any Semblance of Ingenuity, Argument, or Learning, comes from a much cleaner Brain than his own.

“ The Necessity of Reviving the Mixture of the
“ Eucharistical Cup, &c. he tells us, is grounded
“ upon the Scripture, interpreted by the Testimony
“ and Practice of the ancient Church, as the best
“ Exposition of the Institutions of Christianity, and
“ the surest Evidence of Apostolical Doctrine.”

For my own Part, I can't guess what this Author designs by this Jargon; for he doth not tell us what Scripture we are to ground this Practice on, nor mention one Father who has interpreted any Text to this Purpose. Every Verse in the New Testament will serve his Turn, as well as any; for he is conscious to himself,

self, that he can point to no particular Part of the Sacred Writings, which seem to favour his Design.

That the Mixture of the Cup, and Prayers for the Dead, &c. were practis'd by some of the Fathers, no Body will deny; but then I can't see that this is any Proof that they are founded in the Holy Scripture, that they are the Institutions of Christianity, or that they were taught by the Apostles, as essentially necessary to the Christian Worship. For if the Practice of the Fathers confirm the Essentiality of these Things, or may be admitted as Evidences, that they are stamp'd with a Divine Authority, then many other ancient Usages of the Church, not contended for by our Author's Party, must appear to be as necessary as those few, for which they so much struggle.

Whether the Matters in Dispute are *inter desideranda* of the Church of *England*, no Ways relates to the Merit of the Cause: For there may be many Things which I may lawfully desire, which I can't think necessary. As for Instance, suppose the Surplice, the Use of the Cross in Baptism, and Kneeling at the Reception of the Sacrament, had been abolish'd at the second Reformation, I might very innocently wish the Revival of these Things, without thinking them essential to Christianity. Whatever Custom I think useful, I must naturally desire. But then I think it my Duty to submit my Opinion to the Judgment of the Church, and prefer her publick Determination to my own private Inclinations. The same Rite which may warm my Soul, may startle the weak Minds of many good Men; the same Ceremony which I may improve to Devotion, another may, perhaps, turn into Superstition; and that ancient Usage which I may think serviceable to my self, may under our present Circumstances be thought injurious to the Welfare of Religion. I am therefore bound by the common Laws of Society to regard the Good of others, and ought to be satisfied with what the Church shall think most conducive to the common Advantage of her Members. In short, I think, I need not prove, that the Honour, Interest, and Unity of the Church, are infinitely to be preferr'd before any Custom, not plainly reveal'd, and com-

commanded in Scripture; nor am I afraid to say, that the best, and most ancient Usages of the Fathers, when compar'd to these, are but mere Trifles.

The Author of the *No Necessity*, to cut the Dispute the shorter, was willing to concede, that it is probable, that our Saviour, at his Supper, made Use of one of the Cups that was prepar'd for the Paschal Solemnity, and that these Cups were generally diluted with Water. This the Answerer thinks sufficient to convince us of the *Necessity and Essentiality of the Mixture*. But where the Sufficiency of the Argument lies, I profess I can't tell. Had our Saviour told his Disciples, that they should commemorate his Death and Passion in diluted Wine, then, without doubt, we were oblig'd carefully to follow his Directions. But since he has left no Instructions about it, I can't see, that a mere Guess that our Saviour made Use of one of the Paschal Cups, is sufficient to prove the Necessity of the Mixture. It has been prov'd, that we have better Grounds to believe, that our Lord made Use of the *Azuma*, than the mixt Cup; and the Reason given for it, was, because we can't find, that the *Jews* were oblig'd, by any positive Law of God, to mix Water with their Wine at the Paschal Solemnity; whereas they were under the highest Penalty oblig'd to put away all Leaven out of their Houses. Now, if our Saviour's using the *Azuma*, be not a sufficient Argument for the Necessity of it, (and this is own'd by the Practice of our Author's Party,) then, I think, we have much less Reason to conclude the Necessity of the mixt Cup, upon a Supposition, that our Saviour made Use of it.

The Answerer is sensible, that this Argument pinches his Cause, and therefore he threatens it with a particular Examination. *First*, (says he) " I deny, that
 " the *Jews* were oblig'd by a positive Law, to put
 " away the Leaven by the Time of the Eucharistical
 " Institution: That was solemniz'd on the Evening of
 " the thirteenth Day, whereas the Leaven was not to
 " be remov'd 'till the Evening of the fourteenth. And
 " *Secondly*, (says he) it is not so certain that our Sa-
 " viour instituted unleavened Bread, as that he insti-
 " tuted

“ tuted the mixt Cup; for the *Eastern* and *Western* Churches are unanimous in their Tradition for the latter, when the former stands only upon the Authority of the *Occidental* Patriarchate ”.

Whether our Saviour kept the Passover according to the legal Time, is nothing to our present Purpose. For, if it can be prov'd, that our Lord made Use of unleavened Bread, this is sufficient to answer the Design of the Author of *No Necessity*. Now, to prove this, one would think, there was no further Occasion than to cite the three Evangelists, (a) who all testify, That upon the Day of unleavened Bread, the Disciples came, to know where they should keep the Passover. For, what can the Days of unleavened Bread mean, but that solemn Time, in which it was unlawful to make Use of any Bread that was leavened. Besides, this glaring Evidence, which neither this Writer, nor the Author of the *Defence* and *Vindication* of it, has taken any Notice of, the famous Controversy between the *Asiatics* and Pope *Victor*, puts the Thing out of Question. The *Asiatics* insisted, That *Easter* ought to be kept on the fourteenth Moon, upon whatever Day of the Week it happen'd, because it was the Day prescrib'd the *Jews* for killing the Lamb, and *Polycrates* defends this Custom, as the Tradition of *St. Philip*, *St. John*, and several others, all which (says he) celebrated *Easter* when the *Jews* cast out the Leaven. (b) I can see no Reason, why the *Asiatics* should be so studious to retain this Custom, unless it was, because they had receiv'd it from their Ancestors; that Christ perform'd the Passover upon the very fourteenth Day of the Moon, according to the Prescription of the Law. This one Testimony might be sufficient to prove, that our Saviour fulfill'd the legal Passover upon the first Day of unleavened Bread. But because this Writer is pleas'd to assert, That *there is no Tradition*

(a) Matt. 26. 17. Mark 14. 12. Luke 22. 7, 8.

(b) Οὗτοι πάντες ἐτήρησαν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτης τῆς πάσχα. — Καὶ πάντοτε τὴν ἡμέραν ἤμαρ οἱ συγγενεῖς μου, ὅταν ὁ λαὸς ᾤρνε τὸ ζῆμνον. Euseb. Hist. Lib. V. Cap. 24.

tion for our Saviour's using unleavened Bread, whereas the Eastern and Western Churches are unanimous for the Mixture of the Cup. I shall take the Trouble to shew him his Mistake.

Origen, (c) in the beginning of his Treatise upon St. Matthew, says, That Christ was taken by the Jews upon the fourteenth Month, and from thence concludes, That upon the same Moon the Passover was celebrated by our Saviour. And in the latter End of the Treatise he says, That Christ did perform his last Passover after the Jewish manner.

St. Chrysostom in several parts of his Works, and more particularly in his 81 and 82 Homily on the 26 of Matthew, declares; That our Saviour kept the Passover according to the Legal Custom of the Jews, and that he celebrated his last Supper after the Passover. To these I might add the Testimony of Theodoret (d) and many more of the Greeks. And as for the Latin Fathers who treat of the Passover, They all agree that Christ did celebrate his last Supper in unleaven'd Bread upon the Fourteenth Moon. Thus St. Ambrose, He therefore who spake the Law, afterwards coming through a Virgin in the last Times, finish'd the Fulness of the Law; because he came not to destroy, but to fullfill the Law; and celebrated the Passover, upon the Fifth Day of the Week, on which was the Fourteenth Moon. In a word, upon that very Day, as we have shew'd before, he did eat the Passover with his Disciples; but upon the following day, that is upon the Sixth Day, he was crucified, it being upon the Fifteenth Moon. (e)

St.

(c) Origen Tract. 35 in Matt. Vide etiam Commentaria super Joh. Evang.

(d) Quest. 24 in Exod.

(e) Ipse ergo qui legem locutus est, postea veniens per Virginem novissimis temporibus plenitudinem legis consummavit, quia venit non Legem solvere sed implere: & celebravit Pascha, Hebdomadæ in quâ fuit quarta decima Luna quintâ feriâ. Denique ipso die, sicut superiora docent, Pascha cum Discipulis manducavit; Sequenti autem die, hoc est, sexta feria crucifixus est, Lunâ quintâ decimâ. St. Ambr. Epist. de Festo Paschal. ad Episcop. per Emiliam constitutos. Edit. Paris.

St. *Austin* in his *Epistle to Casulanus*, giving him the reason of fasting upon the fourth and sixth Holyday, plainly proves ; *That the Jews took counsel to take Jesus upon the fourth Holyday, one Day being past, upon the Evening of which our Lord eat the Passover with his Disciples, which was the end of that Day, which we call the Fifth of the Sabbath. Afterwards (says he) he was betray'd that night which belong'd to the Sixth of the Sabbath, which is the certain Day of his Passion. This was the first Day of unleavened Bread, beginning from the Evening. But St. Matthew says, That the Fifth Day of the Sabbath was the first Day of unleaven'd Bread ; because the Paschal Supper was to be on the following Evening, at which Supper, the unleaven'd Bread and slain Lamb began to be eaten ; from which, says he, we may conclude, that it was the Fourth Day of the Sabbath, when our Lord said ye know that after two Days is the Passover. (f) It is plain, That this Father was of Opinion, That Christ celebrated the Passover that Evening, upon which the unleaven'd Bread and Lamb began to be eaten, and that he eat the Passover with his Disciples, according to the direction of the Law before the Institution of the Eucharist.*

St. *Jerome* is very clear upon the same point. *The first day of unleaven'd Bread (says he) is the Fourteenth day of the first Month, when the Lamb is slain, and the Moon is at full, and the Ferment is cast away : And again ; After the Typical Passover had been*
com-

(f) Cur autem quartâ & sextâ maxime Jejunet Ecclesia illa ratio reddi videtur, quod considerato Evangelio, ipsa quarta Sabbati, quam vulgo quartam feriam vocant, consilium reperiuntur ad occidendum Dominum fecisse Judæi Intermissio autem uno die, cujus Vespera Dominus Pascha cum Discipulis manducavit qui finis fuit ejus diei, quem vocamus quintam Sabbati. Deinde traditus est eâ nocte, quâ jam ad sextam Sabbati, qui dies passionis ejus manifestus est, pertinebat. Hic dies primus azymorum fuit a vespere incipiens : Sed Matthæus Evangelista, quintam Sabbati dicit fuisse primam diem azymorum, quia ejus vespera sequente futura erat cœna Paschalis, quâ cœna incipiebat azymum, & ovis immolatio manducari. Ex quo colligitur quartam Sabbati fuisse quando ait Dominus : Scitis quia post biduum Pascha fiet, & filius hominis tradetur, ut crucifigatur. *August. Epist. ad Casulanum. Epist. 85.*

completed, and our Saviour had eat the *Flesh* of the *Lamb*, with his *Apostles*, he takes *Bread* which comforts the *Heart* of *Man*, and passes over to the true *Sacrament* of the *Passover*. (f)

To these I might add many more *Greek* and *Latin* Fathers, of good Reputation in the Church, who testify, That our Saviour celebrated the *Paschal* Solemnity, according to the Prescription of the Law, before the Institution of the *Eucharist* : But what I have already produc'd, is sufficient to convince us of the Learning and Modesty of the Author of this part of the Pamphlet. (g)

Whether the Western Church has all along made use of unleaven'd Bread, is nothing to the purpose : and therefore our Author might have spar'd his Citation from Cardinal *Bona*, whom he unfairly insinuates as condemning his own Communion of Novelty, for using the *Azuma* ; for the Cardinal asserts, That our Saviour made use of unleaven'd Bread at his last Supper, (b) and this is all that the Author of the *No Necessity* was concern'd for. But since Cardinal *Bona* is appeal'd to by our Author, as condemning his own Communion, for using the *Azuma*, it may not be amiss to shew the Reader how unfairly he has misrepresented that great Man, by producing his own words in his Preface to the Reader, before his Book *De Rebus Liturgicis* ; His Words are these : ' I have ' asserted with all Orthodox Christians, That Christ ' did consecrate unleaven'd Bread at his last Sup- ' per. 2dly. I said that the Consecration is valid, either
B . ' in

(f) Prima azymorum quarta decima dies mensis primi est, quando agnus immolatur, & Luna plenissima est, & fermentum abjicitur ----- Postquam typicum Pascha fuerat impletum, & agni carnes cum Apostolis comederat, assumit panem qui confortat cor hominis & ad verum Paschæ transgreditur Sacramentum. *St. Hierom L. 4. Comment. in Mat. 26. Verse 17, & 26.*

(g) *Necessity* page 6.

(b) Certum est Christum Redemptorem in ultimâ cœnâ panem azymum comedisse & in eo Eucharistiam instituisse. *Epist. Card. Bonæ ad Mabillon de Azymo.*

‘ in unleaven’d or leaven’d Bread. And 3dly. I affirm,
 ‘ That it is much more convenient to consecrate in un-
 ‘ leaven’d Bread, and to follow the Example of Christ.
 ‘ Nevertheless it cannot be concluded from the Fact of
 ‘ Christ, that it is necessary for us so to do : For the
 ‘ Orientalists use leaven’d Bread, the Apostolical Con-
 ‘ stitutions commanding, that every Nation keep their
 ‘ own (g) Custom’. Now from this the Reader may
 judge of the sincerity of this Author, and what credit
 ought to be given him in his other Quotations.

But to proceed : We have the Testimony of the sa-
 cred Writings, and because these are not thought suf-
 ficient, We have produc’d Tradition, That our Savi-
 our consecrated his last Supper in unleaven’d Bread.
 If therefore it be necessary to mix the Cup, because
 it is presum’d our Saviour drank it mix’d him-
 self, by the same reason it must be necessary for us
 to use unleaven’d Bread, because we have a certain-
 ty, That he consecrated the *Azuma*. That our Saviour
 did not command his Disciples to use *Azuma*, in
 these Words, DO THIS IN REMEMBRANCE OF
 ME, is plain ; from the early Practice of those who
 most commonly us’d fermented Bread : And why
 should the Example of Christ be of Force to oblige
 us in one thing more than the other ?

The Reason given by many learned Men, why
 our Lord used the *Azuma*, is, because there was no
 other Bread to be had when our Saviour celebrated
 his Supper, and not because the nature of the thing
 required it. (b) If therefore our Saviour us’d unlea-
 ven’d Bread *ex occasione & propter morem Gentis*, because
 the

(g) Ego autem asservi cum omnibus orthodoxis Christum in
 ultimâ cenâ azymum consecrasse, Secundo, Quoque dixi validam
 esse Consecrationem tam in Azymo, quam in fermentato. Tertio,
 Affirmo convenientius omnino esse in azymis conficere, & Christi
 exemplum sequi. Dixi tamen ex facto Christi non concludi, ita
 necessariô faciendum : Nam Orientales fermentato utuntur, præcipi-
 entibus Apostolicis Constitutionibus, ut singulæ nationes suum Ritum
 observent. *Præfat. Lib. de Re Liturg.*

(b) Vide Card. Bona de Reb. Liturg. L. 23. Sect. 4. & *Al-
 geri* Lib. 2. Cap. 10. De Sacramento.

the Jews us'd it at that time, why mayn't we suppose our Saviour us'd the mixt Cup upon much the same reason ; for as *Jacobus d Vitriaco* (i) observes, no body uses pure Wine in those parts, and Dr. *Lightfoot* (k) tells us, That the Wine was diluted by the Jews, because it was very strong, and not fit to be drank without Water.

The Writer of *the Necessity* (l) is pleas'd to make a very comical Distinction between Water and Ferment, One he tells us, is the ingredient of the Cup, and consequently part of the matter of it, whereas the other is nothing more than a Quality, Circumstance, and an Accident. That Water is Matter or Substance no body will deny, and can he deny Salt and Ferment to be Matter in this sense ; if Water is a distinct Substance from the Wine, I hope his Senses will inform him that Salt, and Must, are distinct Substances from the *Azyma*. But this Gentleman (who it is plain wants Logick, and Metaphysicks, as well as good Manners,) I suppose means that Water is part of that Matter which properly constitutes the Sacrament : And indeed upon this Point depends the Merits of the Cause, and therefore I shall not tire the Reader, with an Answer to his impertinent Cavils, but shall immediately proceed to examine his Authority and Reasons for this new coin'd Opinion. For among the Multitude of Authors who have wrote upon the Sacrament, we shall not find one Man of Note that backs him in it, even where the Mixture is the constant practice of their Communion.

Justin Martyr is cited to prove Water part of the proper Matter of the Sacramental Cup : His Words are these καὶ ἡ τροφή αὐτὴ καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῶν Ἐυχαιρία. (m) This Food is call'd by us the Eucharist. Now says this Writer, If Bread, Wine and Water be the Eucharist, as this Father asserts, then it must be the Matter of it, because nothing

B 2

can

(i) *Hist. Occident.* Cap. 38.

(k) *Horæ Hebraicæ in Matt.* Tom. 2 p. 257.

(l) *Necessity* Page 6.

(m) *Apolog.* 2.

can be the Eucharist, but what constitutes it, and that is the Matter of it. Besides, he declares that Wine and Water are the Blood of Jesus; now what represents Christ's Blood, is certainly the Matter of the Eucharist, therefore the Mixture is such. And Thirdly, he affirms the mixed Cup to be the Institution of our Lord, as I have prov'd before, but what our Lord instituted, That is without dispute the Matter of the Cup.

That Bread and Wine, tho' mingled with Water, upon a due Consideration, is the Eucharist, no Body as I know of will deny: But doth this prove, That Water is as much the Constituent Matter of the Eucharist as Wine: Doth not the Roman Communion always mingle the Cup? And yet they unanimously declare, That Water is no part of the proper Matter of the Sacrament. But, 2dly. That, *Justin Martyr* calls Wine and Water, *totidem verbis*, the Blood of Jesus, is not true; for the only words of the Martyr, to which he can refer, are these. 'We have been taught, That that Food which has been bless'd by the Prayer of the Word that comes from him, is the Flesh and Blood of that Incarnate Jesus.' (m) Here I can't see that this Author can have any other Design, than to impose upon his unwary Reader by his misrepresenting the words of the Father; for had he given us his genuine words, 'tis plain no new Argument could be drawn from thence. For tho' this Writer denies Bread and Wine to be the Eucharist, and sufficient to represent the Body and Blood of Christ, yet we don't deny that Bread and Wine *when temper'd with Water* is the Eucharist, nor can he say, we don't own the Eucharist to be the Representative of the Body and Blood of our Saviour; which was the only thing intended by the Father in this Passage.

But 3dly. *Justin Martyr* doth not say, That Water as well as Wine is the Institution of our Lord: Had this Father (as our Author pretends he has elsewhere prov'd) affirm'd this; we must have own'd, That
this

this Father was of Opinion, That Water is part of the Matter of the Sacramental Cup. But I am satisfy'd, when we come to consider his Proof, we shall find it very defective in every particular. (†) " The Martyr having related (says our Author) the solemn Action, " and told the Emperour, That the Deacons distribute " to every one that is present, part of the consecrated " Bread and *Wine and Water* &c. That they call'd " this Food the *Eucharist*, and that it was not lawful for any to partake of it, but those that believed their Doctrine to be true and were baptiz'd ; he proceeds. For we do not receive this (*Bread and Wine and Water*) as common Bread, nor common Drink, but as our Saviour Jesus Christ, being made Flesh by the Word of God, had Flesh and Blood for the sake of our Salvation ; so in like manner we have been taught, That that Food (of Bread, *Wine and Water*) which has been *Eucharistiz'd*, or blessed by the Prayer of the Word that comes from him, from which Food we are nourish'd, by it's passing into our Substance, is the Flesh and Blood of that Incarnate Jesus. For so the Apostles in their Commentaries, which are call'd Gospels, have deliver'd ; That Jesus commanded them (to teach) That he having taken Bread, when he had given Thanks, did say : *Do this in Remembrance of me*, this is my Body : And likewise, That he having taken the Cup, (of *Wine and Water*) and given thanks, did say ; This Cup of *Wine and Water* is my Blood. And is here no intimation, says our Author, That our Saviour commanded the Apostles to mix the Cup. To which I answer, No, not the least Intimation as I can see, and take out these Words, the (Cup of *Wine and Water*) which are neither the words of our Saviour, nor this holy Martyr, no Man of common Capacity will think so. For this Father doth not say, our Saviour commanded them to mix *Wine and Water* ; Nothing like it : But he tells the Emperour, That our Saviour commanded the Apostles to teach, that he took Bread, and when he had given Thanks, He said ; Do this
in

(†) Necessity Pag. 17.

in Remembrance of me ; and likewise that he having taken the Cup and given Thanks, said, This is my Blood. 'Tis plain, That all the other part of the Quotation, is no more than a punctual Account of the Christians Practice, without the least Intimation of Christ's Precept ; and is there any thing more in this part, than a bare Relation of what we have in the Gospel ? Or doth the Martyr here make a stronger Intimation of Christ's Command, than the Evangelists have done before him ? But let us see how he makes out this Intimation of the Father : Why he tells us the Case is plainly this. "*Justin Martyr*, acquaints the Emperour, That the Christians receiv'd the Sacramental Cup mix'd, That what they did at this Solemnity, was in virtue of our Saviour's Command mention'd in the Gospel, the words are (says this Writer) as the Martyr goes on : Do this in Remembrance of me. (n)

Did not the Martyr tell the Emperour, That they saluted one another with a Kiss ? And yet I hope our Author won't say, This was in virtue of our Saviour's Command in the Gospel. Doth the Martyr tell the Emperour of any other Gospel than what we have ? And where do we find any such Command in any of them ? Yes, (says this Writer) *The Words are as the Martyr GOES ON, Do this in Remembrance of me.*

I am afraid our Author goes on, without either the Martyr or the Gospel : For the Martyr only tells the Emperour, That when our Saviour took the Cup and gave Thanks, he said this is my Blood : But that our Saviour at the Distribution of the Cup, said ; Do this in Remembrance of me, is our Author's Interpolation, and consequently no Intimation of the holy Martyr, That our Saviour commanded us to mix Wine ; but suppose the Martyr had said, That we were inform'd in the Gospel, That our Saviour after he took the Cup, said ; *Do this in Remembrance of me.* It is plain, that he had been mistaken, because not one of the Evangelists has said so. 'Tis true indeed, St. Paul in his Epistle to the *Corinthians*, (which I suppose

suppose neither the Martyr, nor this Writer calls the Gospel) tells us, That our Saviour took the Cup, when he had supp'd, saying ; *This Cup is the new Testament of my Blood* : This do ye, as often as ye drink it in Remembrance of me. But then it is plain to every one who reads the Father, that here he makes no Reference to this Passage of St. Paul's Epistle : But after all, suppose, That the Martyr had told the Emperour, that when our Saviour blessed the Cup, he had said ; *Do this in Remembrance of me*, yet it will not appear, that the Martyr would hereby signify to the Emperor, That our Saviour commanded his Disciples to mix the Cup. For is not Bread, and Wine and Water brought to the Roman Priest ? Don't they call the Consecrated Bread and Cup, the *Eucharist*, or Body and Blood of Christ ? And yet our Author knows, that they deny Water to be the Matter of the Sacrament ; tho' at the Consecration they make use of these Words : As often as ye shall do these things, ye shall do them in Remembrance of me. (o)

There is another Instance, which our Author thinks will prove this Father to believe, that our Saviour instituted Water. *The Father observes, That the Devils imitated this Mystery in their Worship of Mithra, and how, says our Author, did they imitate it : Why the Father says, by offering Bread and a Cup with Water in it, in their Sacrifices. Now (says our Author) if the Apologist did not believe there was Water in the Instituted Cup, to what purpose is this Instance brought to prove the Resemblance ?*

Suppose the Father believed Water was in the Instituted Cup, doth this prove, That he must believe, that Water was the instituted Matter of the Cup ? This is our Controversy, and not the other. However this Passage neither proves one or the other, and to what purpose our Author cites it, I can't tell. For the Worshippers of *Mithras* at their Mysteries, or *Mythriaca*, did not imitate the matter of the Sacrament but the Mystery it self ; They did not imitate the *Res oblatas*, what the Christians offer'd, but
Oblationem

(o) Hæc quotiescunque feceritis in mei memoriam facietis.
Canon Missæ.

Oblationem ipsam, the Oblation it self. For had they design'd to imitate the *Res oblatas*, they would have made use of Wine; whereas they might design to imitate the *Mystery* it self, without making use of Wine, or Water, but any other Liquor, whatever they pleas'd. The *Calvinists* say, That the Sacrament is valid, tho' they should only make use of Bread and Beer, and should any one of them in Consequence of this Opinion consecrate Bread and Beer, he would imitate the *Eucharist* it self, and yet consecrated Beer doth not in the least resemble the proper Matter of the Eucharistical Cup. The next Father which our Author says proves Water to be the Matter of the Cup, is *Irenaus*, whose Words are ; *Temperamentum Calicis suum sanguinem confirmavit* ; (p) which our Author translates, *our Saviour call'd the mix'd Cup his Blood*.

Doth this prove, That the Father thought, that our Saviour declared Water to be the proper Matter of the Sacrament, because he says, our Saviour call'd what was pour'd into the Cup, his Blood : For he doth not tell us what was mix'd in it. *Temperamentum Calicis* doth not signify a Cup of Wine and Water, but any thing else the Cup is fill'd withal. And it is plain, the Father makes use of those Terms which our Author translates *Mixture* in this very sense which I have given. This Writer according to the *Defence* translates, *Reprobant itaque hi Commistionem vini cœlestis, et sola aqua secularis volunt esse, non recipientes Deum ad mixturam suam*. These (viz. *Ebionites*) reject the Mixture of the heavenly Wine, and only make use of Water, excluding God from their Mixture : He won't dispute now, whether this is a fair Translation of the Father, for we can easily play this Translation against our Author. Here the Father tells us, That the *Ebionites* reject the Mixture of the heavenly Wine, but doth not say one word of Water mix'd with this Wine. And if these Allegorical Expressions refer to the Sacrament, it is plain he can mean no more than the Wine which was pour'd into the Cup, because he calls the Cup of pure Water which the *Ebionites* made use of
for

for the Sacramental Cup *Commistionem suam*. That the *Ebionites* had nothing mix'd in their Cup but pure Water, is evident from *Epiphanius*. (q) If therefore the Father calls the *Ebionitish* Cup *Commixtionem suam*, (their Mixture as this Writer construes the Word) tho' it is certain there was nothing but Water pour'd into it, why should we suppose, that he means by his other synonymous Expressions, any more than what was pour'd into the Sacramental Cup? For it is plain, that there is not the least intimation of the Mixture of Water with the Wine in the *Eucharistical* Cup to be found in any Part of this Father's Writings.

That τὸ κερῆσαι, *miscere*, &c. signify to pour out, and are often made use of, when they relate only to a simple and unmix'd Liquor, has been made appear from the Authority of some eminent Classicks, which our Author is not able to disprove: And were it needful, I could add many more of very good Note, who in the Judgment of the best Criticks in their Comments upon them, often use the Words κερῆνναι, *miscere* &c. in the Signification, I have given of them. But this Writer who seems to be a Stranger to the Classicks, is not pleas'd with Quotations from Heathen Orators and Poets. He is for interpreting κερῆνναι, *mixture* &c. by Ecclesiastical Authors. And here in his own way, it is plain, we are too hard for him: For *Irenæus* calls a Cup of pure unmix'd Water, *commistionem suam*. There is another Author indeed, who has a Share in this doughty Performance that pretends to account for this Expression: (r) It is done it seems *Per Catachresin*. "Thus, says he, we speak of the abolish'd Priesthood of the Jews, as if it was unextinguish'd, and call those Priests that have no Commission.

Whether this Example be proper to a *Catechresis*, I leave it to those who understand Rhetorick: However it is pretty plain the Parallel will not hold, We call an abolish'd Priesthood a Priesthood, and
C there-

(q) Hæres. 30.

(r) Appendix to the Necessity, Page 193.

therefore we may call a Cup of Water a Cup of Wine and Water. *Catachresis*, is a Figure when one Word is abusively put for another, and not an Addition of one Thing to another; which is the Case before us. We may perhaps call a Cup, when there is nothing but *Water* in it, a *Wine Cup*, as we call a *Pool* (by this Figure) a *Fish Pond* when there are no *Fish* in it, but to say a *Cup of Water* signifies a *Cup of Wine and Water*, is an horrid Abuse of a *Catachresis*, and warranted by no Instance either of Profane or Ecclesiastical Authors. This Writer indeed tells us that *Epiphanius* calls the *Ebionitish* Cup the *Sacramental Cup* : But here I am afraid he must recur to some other Figure to save his Credit ; for the Words of *Epiphanius* are these : They (speaking of the *Ebonites*) *Perform the Mysteries every Year in imitation of the Saints which are in the Church in unleaven'd Bread, and the other part of the Mystery by Water alone* (s). The Father doth not say they celebrated the Sacrament, but Mysteries, or Rites, and these not only *Ebion* and *Tatian*, but the Heathens also perform'd in imitation of the Church, in Bread and Water ; but I could never find any Father who call'd these Pagan Mysteries by the Name of the Eucharist or Sacramental Cup. And I think this Writer may as well say that *Justin Martyr* (t) call'd the Cup of Water, us'd in the *Mithriaca*, or Mysteries of *Mithras*, in Imitation of the Christians, the Sacramental Cup, as that *Epiphanius* calls the *Ebionitish* Cup so : This Writer therefore warily left out the Words of the Historian ; for he could not but be sensible, that the Words fairly construed would not bear the Signification he has given them. And yet, had it been true, that *Epiphanius* had call'd the *Ebionites* Cup, the *Sacramental Cup* ; this won't answer the Purpose. Because it might be call'd the *Sacramental*

(s) Μυστήρια ἃ δίδεν τελεῖσι καὶ μίμνησιν οἱ ἄγιοι ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀπὸ ἐνταυτὸ εἰς ἐνταυτὸν δι' αἰσμάτων, καὶ τὸ ἀλλὸ μέρος τῆς μυστηρίου δὲ ὕδατος μόνον. In Hier. 30.

(t) Vide Apolog. 2.

mental Cup, from the Consecration it self, and not from the particular Matter consecrated in it.

But after all, suppose that *Irenæus* did mean by *Temperamentum Calicis*, a Cup of Wine mixt with Water, yet this doth not prove the Water to be any part of the proper Matter of the Eucharistical Cup: For as I said before, Don't the *Roman Catholicks* call their mix'd Cup, the Blood of Christ, and yet strenuously deny the Water to enter into the Essence of the Sacrament.

The next Father cited to prove Water the matter of the Cup, is, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who, says this Writer, informs us; That the mixed Cup was the Institution of the Λόγος, and declares that it is the spiritual Blood of Christ; and that after Consecration it is called the Eucharist; which are all of them so many Evidences, that Water is part of the matter of the Sacramental Cup: For it could not be the Institution of the Logos, the Blood of Christ, or the Eucharist unless it was the matter of the Instituted Cup.

Sure our Author has a License to say what he pleases, or he thinks his Cause will justify any sort of Management: For the Father no where tells us, that Water was the Institution of the Λόγος, the Blood of Christ, or the Eucharist. He may indeed pretend from his own base Translation of the Father to prove he believed this; but then I think there is a wide Difference from his own false Inferences that the Father might believe so, and his telling us that the Father inform'd us, that the mixed Cup was the Institution of the Logos &c. This seems to be a pious Fraud; for had he not designed to impose upon the unwary *English* Reader, he should have given him the very Words of the Father himself.

How Justly this Writer has translated this Father in Page 36, 37: I leave it to the Judgment of those who are acquainted with the Original (u) Language, yet even his own Translation as insincere

C 2

and

(u) Φυσικὸν μὲν ἐν τῇ νηφάλιον ποτὸν ἀνασκαῖον δι-ψῶσιν ὄσιν ὕδαρ, ὅσο το ἐκ τῆ ἀκροτόμου πέτραις χελεῖσθόμενον τοῖς παλαιῖς καὶ Ἐβραίων, μονότροπον σωφροσύνης ὁ κύριος ἐχορήγει ποτὸν νήφειν ὃ μάλιστα ἐχρεῖται

and false as it is, won't answer his purpose. The Passage is this ; " Water is the Drink that Nature requires, and Temperance directs for the Thirsty ; thus the Lord gave to the *Hebrews* for drink alone the Waters which flow'd from the stony Rock ; for a temperate Draught became them, while they remain'd in a wandring State : At length the sacred Vine (the Vine which grew in *Canaan's* holy Land) bare the Prophetick Grapes. The Sign then given to those, who from a State of wandring have been led into a State of Rest ; was the great Cluster, the *Logos* who was press'd for us ; *THIS LOGOS THE Blood of the Grape*, ordering that it self should be mix'd with Water, as his Blood is Incorporated with Salvation : Now the Blood of our Lord, is Two-fold ; the one Carnal, by which we are redeemed from Death ; the other Spiritual, wherewith we are anointed : And to drink the Blood of Christ, is to partake of our Lord's Immortality. For the Spirit is the Life giving Principle of the *Logos*, as the Blood is of the Flesh : As then the Wine is mixed with the Water, so is the Spirit with Man, the one, namely the Mixture, leads us unto Faith ; but the other, which is the Spirit, conduceth to immortal Life. Now the mixture of these two, the Drink, and the *Logos*, is nam'd the *Eucharist*. Our Author, I hope, won't say, that this Translation will answer, like Tallies, to the Original ; even in those places where he pretends the Merits of

ἡ χρῆν τὰς ὀπιπλανωμένους. Ἐπειτα ἡ ἀμπελὶς ἡ ἀγία τὸ βόσυν
 Ἐβλάσσει τὸ ποσειπικόν. Τὸ σημεῖον τοῖς εἰς ἀνάπαυσιν ἐκτὶ
 πλάνης πεπαιδαγωγούμενοις, ὁ μέγας βοτρυς, ὁ λόγος ὁ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν
 θλιβείς, τὸ αἶμα τὸ σαφυλῆς ὕδατι κίρνασθαι ἐδειλήσαντο τὸ λό-
 γος ὡς καὶ τὸ αἶμα αὐτοῦ σωτηρία κίρναται. διπλὸν δὲ τὸ αἶμα τὸ κυεῖν
 τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὅστις αὐτὸ σαρκικὸν ὧς τῆς φθορᾶς λελυθώμεθα. τὸ δὲ πνευμα-
 τικὸν τετέστιν ὧς κεχρίσμεθα. καὶ τὸ τ' ἐστὶ πᾶν τὸ αἶμα τὸ Ἰησοῦ τὸ
 κυριακῆς μεταλαβεῖν αἰσθησίας, ἵνα καὶ τὸ λόγος τὸ πνεῦμα, ὡς αἶμα
 σαρκός. Ἀναλόγως ποίνυν κίρναται, ὁ μὲν οἶνον τῷ ὕδατι, τῷ δὲ αὐ-
 τῷ πνεύματι. Καὶ τὸ μὲν, εἰς πᾶσιν ἐνώχῃ, τὸ κρέμα. τὸ δὲ
 εἰς αἰσθησίαν ἐδηγῇ, τὸ πνεῦμα. ἢ δὲ ἀμφοῖν αὐτῶς κρέμας, ποτὶς τε
 καὶ λόγος, εὐχαριστία κέκληται. Clem. Alex. Pædag. Lib. II. Cap. 2.
 p. 151, Edit. Paris. 1641.

of the Cause Iye. And yet as bad as it is ; I can't see in what part of it, the Father declares that Water was the Institution of the *Logos*, the Blood of Christ, or the *Eucharist*, as this Writer affirms : And I am satisfied he will be puzzled to show what Words he can possibly wrest to this meaning. The Mixture which the Father in his mystical way of speaking calls the *Eucharist* is not a Cup of Wine mix'd with Water, but *κεράσις ποτῆς τε καὶ λόγου* a Mixture of Drink and the Word. Nor doth it appear that the Wine which the Father speaks of, relates to the Sacramental Cup. The Words are these *ἀναλόγως, πόινυν κίρναι, ὁ μὲν δίνῃ, τὸ ὕδαπ, τὸ δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ, τὸ πνεῦμα* : As Wine is mix'd with Water, so is the Spirit with Man. And the other Sentence, which I suppose our Author chiefly fixes his Eye upon, is this ; *τὸ αἷμα τῆ σαφολῆς ὕδαπ κίρναι εἰς ἐπελήπαν τὸ λόγῳ, ὡς καὶ τὸ αἷμα αὐτῆς σωτεία κίρναι*. Which can admit of no other fairer Translation than these Two. The Word being willing to be mix'd with the Water of the Blood of the Grape, or the Blood of the Grape, i. e. the Word being willing to be mix'd with Water, as his Blood is mingled with Salvation. Now let us take which way we please, I am apt to think no Body can clearly shew what the Father means. However, it is plain he doth not here inform us that our Saviour commanded the Sacramental Cup to be mix'd with Water, nor doth he tell us of any Direction, which our Saviour has given us about the Celebration of the Sacrament : Tho' this is what our Author should prove, or else he can say nothing to the Purpose.

The Design and Scope of the Father in this Chapter, is to recommend Sobriety and Temperance, and not to instruct us how to perform the *Eucharist* ; his Arguments are levell'd against Drunkenness, and not against the use of pure Wine at the sacred Solemnity ; and when he recommends Water it is for the Use of the thirsty, and not as the proper Matter of the *Eucharist*. In short who ever reads his Writings, will get very little light from them, into the Mysteries of our Religion : For he declares it was not lawful to explain them in Writing, but only by Word of Mouth to those who were

were deem'd worthy of the Communication. (x) Now let us but consider this Declaration of the Father, and that when ever he says any thing that relates to the Mysteries of Christianity ; he industriously makes use of allegorical, dark, and enigmatical Phrases, such as could be understood by none but those who were personally acquainted with him, and so might partly know his Design by his mystical Phrases. I say, let us but consider this, and we can't but own it very unreasonable, to conclude the certainty of a Point of so great moment as our Author pretends this to be.

In every Controversy the proofs ought to be full and clear, and the Authorities such as will admit of no dispute of the Intention of the Author : Now I appeal to the learned World, whether this Father clearly shews us, That our Saviour instituted Water as the proper Matter of the Sacramental Cup; or whether he design'd in any part of this Chapter, to urge the Necessity of using Water with Wine at the sacred Solemnity.

But after all it is plain from some other parts of this Father's Writings, That he did not think Water was the Matter of the *Eucharist* : For he tells us that *the Scriptures nominated Wine as the mystical Symbol of the Holy Blood* (y) : And in another place, (z) he says *That our Saviour us'd Wine, and what he bless'd was Wine, when he said, take, drink, this is my Blood, the Blood of the Vine.* And a little after he says, *That our Lord shew'd again, that what was bless'd or consecrated was Wine, saying to his Disciples : " I will not drink of the Fruit of the Vine, till I drink it with you in my Father's Kingdom*

(x) Vide *Stromat.* Lib. 1. p. 275. & Lib. 4. p. 539. *Edit. Paris.* 1641.

(y) Μυστικὸν ἄρα σύμβολον ἡ γραφὴ αἷμα ὁ αἷν οἶνον ὀνομασεν *Pædag.* Lib. II. p. 156.

(z) Μετέλαβεν οἶνον καὶ αὐτός. — Καὶ εὐλογησέν γε τὸ οἶνον εἰπὼν, λάβετε, πίετε. Τῷτο μὲν ἔστι τὸ αἷμα, αἷμα τῆς ἀμπελῆς — ὅτι ὃ δυνάμει τὸ εὐλογηθὲν ἀπέδειξε πάλιν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς λέγων ἡ μὴ πῶς ἐκ τῆς γενήμα ἡ ἀμπελὶς ταύτης μεχρὶς ἀνὰ πᾶν αὐτὸ μεθ' ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου. — Ἀλλ' ὅτι γε οἶνον ἦν τὸ πινόμενον, πρὸς τοὺς κρείνους, πάλιν αὐτὸς αὐτὸς λέγει. *Pædag.* Lib. II. p. 158.

dom. And again, *Our Lord says of himself, That it was Wine which was drank by him.* All which Passages plainly prove, that the Father did not think Water, but Wine only, the proper Matter of the Sacramental Cup. Here his Expressions are full and clear, That *Wine* was what our Saviour consecrated to represent his Blood, they admit of no ambiguous Interpretation, nor can our Author pretend they are of so doubtful a Meaning, as the dark Allegories he has cited to prove his novel Notion: It is hard, that we must throw aside so many Passages which so directly Point to the Matter, and touch the very Question it self, and apply to affected Allegories and ænigmatical Phrases, which the Father industriously design'd should not be commonly understood. Thus I think I have plainly prov'd, That neither *Justin Martyr, Irenæus, or Clemens Alexandrinus*, favour our Author's Notion, that Water is the proper Part of the Matter of the Eucharistick Cup. And as for their Predecessors and Contemporaries, I am perswaded, that neither our Author, nor his Abettors, can bring one Instance from them; which certainly proves the Mixture to be even their Practice; much less that it was prescrib'd by them as a necessary Duty: And the only Reason which can be assign'd for the belief of the Mixtures being a common Usage of most Churches before *Justin Martyr's* Time, is that the first Churches were planted in those Places where it was reckon'd a Disgrace, or thought inconvenient to drink pure Wine. The People of those Climes were usually temperate, their Wine was very strong, and the meetings of the Christians were very early in the Morning, and therefore call'd *Antelucani cætus*, and it is probable, the Quantity that they drank might be often much larger, than the Custom of this time allows. These Considerations may induce us to think it not unlikely, that the mix'd Cup, was a common Usage of the ancient Christians: But yet a common Usage, (for all this Writer pretends to play the Expression against the Author of *The No Necessity*,) doth not always suppose a constant and uninterrupted Practice, much less an indispensable Duty.

We

We may justly say, That Wine is the common Usage of the *Church of England*, notwithstanding there are several Parishes, which to this very Day use the Mixture. But to proceed, The Author of the *No Necessity* produc'd St. Cyprian as an Evidence, that *Water* was no part of the *proper Matter* of the sacred Cup, tho' it is granted he warmly pleads for the use of it, because he thought it might contain some mystical Significations. The first Instance was this : For when Christ says, I am the true Vine, the Blood of Christ certainly is *not Water but Wine*. (a) Now can any words be more decisive against our Authors Hypothesis than these : Doth he not expressly determine the Case, in the Sense of the Author of the *No Necessity* ? Here the Original Words will bear no other Translation, and therefore our Author can't pretend to make them speak another Sense by his usual way of false Constructions. The Expression is home to the purpose for which it was produc'd, and directly answers the very Question in Dispute. And our Author is so sensibly pinch'd with it, that he leaves the matter of the Dispute, and is forc'd to retire to his usual way of shuffling : St. Cyprian, says he, *is here arguing against the Aquarii a Sect which us'd Water only in the Eucharistick Cup*. And what is this to the purpose were it true ? When the Father's Argument is as strong against his Sect, who make it one of their main pretences of leaving the *Church of England*, that *Water* is the proper matter of the Cup, and enters the Essence of the Sacrament. But says our Author, St. Cyprian *did not design to exclude Water by this Argument*, and who says that he doth as a significant Rite ? But that he excludes Water as the matter of the Cup, or representative Blood of Christ, is plain *totidem verbis*. This is our present Dispute, and I am certain our Author can't find out any other Expressions which more forcibly shut out Water from being the

(a) Nam cum dicat Christus : Ego sum Vitis vera ; Sanguis Christi non aqua est utique sed Vinum. *Epist. ad Cecil.* p. 148. *Edit. Oxon.*

the representative Blood, than what has been produc'd from this Father.

After all he is not willing to lose St. Cyprian, and therefore he produces a Passage from him, which he thinks will be more favourable to his Hypothesis. He construes the Passage thus ; *I wonder, saith he, whence this Usage comes, That contrary to Evangelical and Apostolical Directions, in some Places, Water is offer'd in the Lord's Cup, which without Wine cannot represent the Blood of Christ.* (b) And here I must tell him, That he has industriously construed the latter part of this Passage false : For he knows that *Sola* doth not signify *without Wine*. I shall therefore give a fair Translation of it, for the sake of the English Reader. *In some places Water is offer'd in the Lord's Cup, which alone cannot resemble the Blood of Christ.* Now I can't see how this Passage can any ways serve our Author's purpose, nor can I see what pretence he can have for saying, That the Martyr in these words, plainly intimates, that Water with Wine may represent the Blood of Christ : For here the Father doth not make the least mention of Wine, but only says, that *Water alone* can not resemble Christ's Blood.

The true Case is this : The Father is not here as our Author ignorantly asserts, pleading against the *Aquarii*, who were either *Ebionites* or *Encratites*, Hereticks which declar'd the use of Wine upon all accounts abominably wicked and unlawful, but against some ignorant and simple Christians, (in Communion with the Church) who thought Water alone might be sufficient to represent the Blood of Christ, and therefore us'd no Wine for fear of a Persecution. For the Heathen at that time, it seems, were wont to smell the Breaths of the Christians, and if they found thereby that they had been drinking of Wine, they concluded they had been at their *Sacrificia Matutina*, their Morning Sacrifices, and thought this a sufficient Reason to

D

ground

(b) Miror satis unde hoc usurpatum sit, ut contra Evangelicam & Apostolicam Disciplinam quibusdam in locis aqua offeratur in Dominico Calice, quæ sola Christi Sanguinem non possit exprimere. *Epist.* 63. p. 152.

ground a Persecution on. Some weak Christians therefore at this time us'd only Water in the Cup. *Ne per saporem Vini redolerent sanguinem Christi*, least thro' the Scent of the Wine, they should smell of the Blood of Christ. Now against these simple Christians whom fear had drawn into this Error, and not against the *Aquarian Hereticks*, the Father levels his Argument, and proves from many Texts of Scripture, That Wine only represents the Blood of Christ. Nay even this very Passage which our Author has cited, was design'd by the Father to prove, That Water was no part of the proper Matter of the Sacramental Cup : For he immediately subjoins a Text out of the Psalms, by which, he says, the holy Spirit intended to shew the matter of the Lord's Cup. *Thy Cup is inebriating*. Now, says he, That Cup which inebriates, certainly is fill'd with Wine, for Water cannot inebriate any one. In short, the Father throughout this whole Epistle is strenuously arguing, that Water is not, but Wine is the proper matter of the Cup, and representative of Christ's Blood. His Terms by which he expresses this, are very full and clear, and even the very Passage cited by our Author, is directly levell'd against his Opinion. With what Modesty then can this Author tell us, That the Father puts Wine upon the Level with Water. (c) When the Martyr so frequently declares, That Wine is the Blood, and that Water doth not resemble the Blood of Christ ; He tells us, that Water signifies the People. *We see*, says the Father, *That in the Water the People are understood, but that the Blood of Christ is represented in the Wine*. (d) Now doth the Father here put the Blood of Christ upon the Level with the People, or doth he intimate, that the People is part of the Blood of Christ ; I hope our Author won't advance another new Notion **THAT AT THE** sacred Table we spiritually drink the People as well as the Blood

(c) Necessity, Pag. 76.

(d) Videmus in aquâ populum intelligi, in Vino vero ostendi Sanguinem Christi. Pag. 153.

Blood of Christ. And this the Father must mean, if he meant to put Wine upon the Level with Water : In short the Case is plainly this, the Father pleads for Water, not as the matter of the Cup, but only as a Rite which he suppos'd contain'd some Mystical Significations, and so long as any Church commands the Use of this Rite, for my own part, I think it the Duty of the Clergy to observe it, but then if it be only a Rite, as has been plainly prov'd, certainly the Church has a Power to drop it when she pleases. But to proceed.

The Author of the *No Necessity*, produc'd *Tertullian*, and *Optatus Milevitanus* as Evidences, That Wine was the only proper matter of the Cup : As for *Tertullian*, he plainly declares, That it was Wine which was Consecrated in remembrance of Christ's Blood. (e) And *Optatus* tells us, That it was Wine which was offer'd in Sacrifice to God : (f) This our Author says is nothing to the Purpose. For it seems his Party, is so fully perswaded of the Essentiality of the Wine, that they look upon the Opinion of the Geneva Divines, who determin'd, that in Case of Necessity, the common Drink of the Country may be us'd instead of Wine at the Eucharistical Solemnity, no better than an Heresy : But then, says he, we think Water Essential also, and we don't find from any thing the Author of the *NO NECESSITY* has prov'd from these Fathers, but they may perfectly agree with his Party in this Point.

Our Question is not whether Wine be Essential, but whether Water is essentially necessary to the Sacrament : Could the one be fully prov'd, yet the other doth not follow. And for my own part, I can't think Wine so essential to the Sacrament, as our Author pretends Water to be. For I believe, that the worthy Communicants are not depriv'd of the Benefit of

D 2

Christ's

(e) Ne forte dicatur ----- alium postea Vini Saporem quod in Sanguinis sui memoriam Consecravit. Lib de Animâ. Sect. 17.

(f) Non & Vinum a Peccatoribus operariis & calcatur, & premittur, & sic inde Deo Sacrificium offertur. De Schism. Donatist. Lib. 3. Sect 4.

Christ's Passion, when through the Knavery of the Wine-Brewer, they don't receive one drop of true Wine at the sacred Altar. This Case I am afraid frequently happens in Country Villages, and perhaps it is out of the Power of the main part of the Communicants to prevent it. Shall we say then, That the good Christian doth not spiritually drink the Blood of Christ at the Altar, because through the baseness of the Wine Seller, he receives no true Juice of the Grape into his Mouth? And yet this naturally follows our Author's Opinion; That the Sacrament is invalid, when true Wine is not in the Cup: I readily grant, that the Holy Cup ought to have true Wine in it: *Vinum de Vite*: But then I can't find, that the Efficacy and Virtue of the Sacrament depends so much upon it, as our Author suggests. Nor do I believe, that the well dispos'd Christian receives one Jot less of spiritual Advantage, when by Accident he drinks brew'd Wine at the Sacrament, than if he were to partake of the finest Juice of the most generous Grape. For it is unreasonable to suppose, that our merciful and righteous Father will punish his faithful Children for that which is not their Fault. Were our Author's Notion true, the Welfare of Multitudes must lye at the Mercy of the Devil's Agents, at least the vast Advantages of the Christian Sacrifice would entirely depend upon the Honesty, and Integrity of the Vintner; and this is an Absurdity I think, needs no Confutation.

But to return to *Tertullian* and *Optatus*: As for *Tertullian*, it is pretty plain, he did not think Water any part of the proper Matter of the Cup; for writing against some Hereticks and Philosophers, who denied the Fidelity of our Senses, He tells us, that we ought not to call it into Question, lest this bring us to doubt of Christianity it self, and lest it be said, that our Saviour neither saw, heard, touch'd, smell'd, or tasted, really those Things which the Scriptures report he did. His Argument runs thus, If we doubt that our Saviour had a real Taste, &c. then perhaps it may be said, that when our Saviour consecrated Wine in Remembrance of his Blood, it was not really Wine, but something else that he tasted.

Tertull.

Tertullian plainly intimates, that there was nothing but Wine which our Saviour instituted as the matter of the Cup, and reckons it an absurdity, to say, that what our Saviour consecrated, had any other taste than that of Wine. If it be said, that tho' Water might be mix'd with the Wine, yet nothing might be tasted but Wine, this will fully answer our Purpose; because if the Quantity of the Water is such as will not alter the Taste of the Wine, we must suppose it is lost in the main Body of it, and to become one and the same Substance with it: So that what was Water before, by this Physical Transubstantiation, is now properly Wine, and therefore not a distinct Matter of the Cup. As for Instance, when our Saviour turn'd the Water into Wine at the Nuptial Festival in *Cana of Gallilee* (g) upon the miraculous Transubstantiation, the Water ceas'd to be Water, and became really Wine, being found to be such only by it's Vinous Taste, and Quality.

If it be said, That this was a miraculous Change, whereas the other proceeds from a natural Cause; this will not alter the Case; for if the Water be changed into the Substance of Wine by any means whatever, it will serve our purpose; which was only to prove, that *Tertullian* thought that what our Saviour consecrated, was no distinct Matter from Wine.

As for *Optatus*, He tells us plainly, that Wine is the Matter of the Sacrament. *Inde Deo Sacrificium offertur*. If therefore Wine be sufficient to represent the Blood of our Saviour which was pour'd out for us, which this Father plainly intimates, then I think it is clear enough, that this Father did not think Water was necessary. It is certain, That neither *Tertullian*, nor this Father in any of their Writings mention Water to be any part of the Matter that represents Christ's Blood; whereas they expressly declare that Wine doth. So that it is pretty plain, that neither *Tertullian* nor *Optatus* agree with our Author's Party.

But besides these Authorities among many, we will produce a few more Fathers, who expressly exclude Water

(g) John 2.

ter as the matter which representeth Christ's Blood. The first is St. Cyril of Jerusalem, who says : *For as the Bread and Wine of the Eucharist before the solemn Invocation of the adorable Trinity was Bread and mere Wine, so after the Invocation, the Bread becomes the Body, and the Wine the Blood of Christ.* (b) And again, *Under the Species of Bread a Body is given unto thee, and under the Species of Wine Blood is given to thee : Don't therefore consider them as common Bread and common Wine.* Here the Father calls the matter of the Cup, mere Wine, *οἶνον* λιπὲς, not Wine and Water; and tells us in plain Terms, that Christ's Blood is represented under the Species of Wine, and that after the Consecration, we ought not to look upon it as common Wine; every one of which Expressions plainly exclude Water from being an essential part of the Sacrament.

St. Chrysostom is likewise of the same Opinion; for preaching against some Hereticks, he says; *That when our Saviour to prove the certainty of his Resurrection eat and drank, he did not drink Water but Wine: He intended says the Father, to extirpate the pernicious Heresy of those who use Water in their Mysteries, by shewing when he deliver'd the Sacrament, that he deliver'd Wine, and when after his Resurrection, he spread a common Table without the Mysteries, he made use of Wine; of the Fruit of the Vine says he, now the Vine produces Wine not Water.* (i) I suppose our Author won't deny, That the Fruit of the Vine is the only proper Matter of the Cup; and if it be so: It is plain, that this Father excludes Water as such, for he tells us, That our Saviour meant by this Phrase nothing else but Wine, and the reason he gives for it, is; because the Vine doth not produce Water but Wine. If

(b) Ὡς περ γὰρ ὁ ἄρτος καὶ ὁ οἶνος τῆς εὐχαριστίας, πρὸ τῆς ἀγίας ἐπι-
κλήσεως τῆς θεοσωτηρίας βιάσθη, ἄρτος, ἢ καὶ οἶνος λιπὲς, ἐπι-
κλήσεως γενομένης ὁ μὲν ἄρτος γίνηται σῶμα Χριστοῦ, ὁ δὲ οἶνος αἷμα
Χριστοῦ. Cateches. Mystag. I. Sect. 4. Ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ ἄρτῳ, δίδεται
σοι τὸ σῶμα καὶ ἐν τούτῳ οἴνῳ, δίδεται σοι τὸ αἷμα. — Μὴ πρὸς σε
ἐν ὡς φιλοῖς τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸν οἶνον. Catech. Mystag. 4.

(i) Δεικνύς ὅτι καὶ ἡνίχα τὰ μυστήρια παρέδωκεν, οἶνον παρέδωκε
καὶ ἡνίχα ἀναστὰς χρεῖς μυστηρίων ψιλὴν βράπεζαν παρεπέδωκε, οἶνον ἐκέ-
χρητο. ἐκ τῆς γεννήματός, φήσι, τῆς ἀμπέλου, ἢ ἀμπελὸς ὃ οἶνον, καὶ
οὐδὲν γέννα. Homil. in Mat. 26.

If it be said, That the Synod of *Trullo* in their Decree against the *Armenians* (k) have explain'd this Passage of the Father, and inform'd us ; that it was levell'd against the *Hydroparastatæ* or *Aquarian* Hereticks, and not against those that mix the Cup : Because they say, that this Father while he govern'd his Church, order'd ; that Water should be mix'd with the Wine at the sacred Solemnity. I answer, That these Fathers did not pretend to prove, That St. *Chrysostom* thought Water the Matter of the Cup, but that he order'd it as a Rite that had a mystical Signification in it. It seems the *Armenians* cited St. *Chrysostom*, for their Opinion of the unlawfulness of the Mixture, and here the Fathers tell them, that they mistook St. *Chrysostom*'s Design, because he himself order'd his Clergy to mix the Cup. This Argument (supposing it true, that the Father did give this Direction) must be very good against the *Armenians*, who upon the Authority of St. *Chrysostom*, pretended to disobey the Orders of that Church, which certainly had a Power to impose an innocent Rite ; but then it can have no Force against us who are Members of a Church, where this Rite is not by any Sanction whatever enforc'd : Because we don't refuse the Mixture upon the same Pretences and Principles as the *Armenians* did.

The next Evidence which I shall produce, is *Theodoret* : Therefore he call'd the Blood of the Grape the Blood of our Saviour, if our Lord was call'd the Vine : Now the Fruit of the Vine is call'd Wine. (l) Here this Father tells us, that the Blood of the Grape which can be nothing but Wine, is the Matter that represents the Blood of our Saviour, and consequently this Father excludes Water from being an essential part of the Sacrament. To these Fathers I might add many more, who in plain Terms witness the same Thing ; Whereas our Author and his Abettors are not able to produce

(k) Canon 33 Synod Trull.

(l) Ἄμα δὲ σαφελῆς τὸ τῷ σωτῆρι προσηγόρευεν αἶμα, ἐν ᾧ ἄμφω ὁ δεσπότης ἀνέμασαι, ὃ δ' ἄμπελον καρπὸς, οὖν προσε-
γόρευε. Theodoret. Dialog. 1. Vol. 4 Edit. Paris. Pag. 17.

produce one Father to the Contrary. Nay the Case seems so plain, that many Authors of Note in their Writings *De Rebus Liturgicis*, and upon the *Eucharist*, take it for a conceded Point, that Wine is the only proper Matter of the Cup, and there is not, (I believe) one Author of any Credit in the learned World besides the ingenious Author of the Defence, who ever pretended to dispute it. If therefore Water be no part of that Matter whereby Christ design'd to represent his Blood, then it is plain, that it can be no more than a Circumstantial Rite ; or as the School-men say, an adjunct ; And consequently not essentially necessary to the Validity and Integrity of the *Eucharist*. This the Author of the *No Necessity* further prov'd from the various Reasons which were given in different Places and Times, for the use of Water in the Eucharistick Cup : Some us'd the Mixture to represent the Water and Blood that flow'd from our Saviour's Side, Others to shew the Union of Christ and his Church ; Several us'd Water to signify the People, Others because the Mixture was more pleasant and agreeable to their Nature, and therefore fitter to represent this spiritual Drink ; Some us'd to mix the Cup, after Consecration with warm Water, to signify the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Church, Others again did the same, to represent Mysteries of a quite different Nature ; (m) and in short there was one Reason for the Mixture which prevail'd a long Time, and that was to signify the two Nature's of Christ. Now it is certain, that our Saviour at his Institution, did not oblige us to make any of these mystical Significations, and consequently they are no more than voluntaries, and the Reasons which supported them, cannot have the force of a Law upon the *Church of England*, who acts by Virtue of her *αυτοκράτεια* upon her own Members, and not under the Jurisdiction, or upon the reasons of any of these Churches.

Our Author is pleas'd to say, *That the Uniformity and uninterrupted Continuance of the Practice* (of mixing the Water

(m) Vide Nicolai Cabasilæ Liturg. Exposit. Cap. 37. 38. & Germanum in Theoriâ rerum Ecclesiastic.

Water) amidst the various Reasons that were assign'd of the Mystery rather prove the contrary, and shew us the necessity of the Mixture. Their Agreement in the use of the mixt Cup, and their Reasons how different soever from one another, do both of them point out to us the Essentiality of the Practice. (n)

Here I must tell our Author, that he begs the Question which will by no means be granted him; and I am pretty sure, neither he nor his Abbettors will ever be able to prove, that Water was the constant and uninterrupted Practice of the Church. For till many Years after the first Century, we have no certain Information from any one that it was ever us'd, and but very few Fathers of the second and third Century take any manner of Notice of it : For ought we know, it might be us'd in one Church, and not thought of in another, and it might be the Usage of this Century, and not regarded in the next, even in the same Country. It is possible it might be us'd in *Justin Martyr's* Time about *Palestine*, and not in several other Places. It might be us'd by the *Africans* when *St. Cyprian* flourish'd, and not at all regarded in *Tertullian's* Time. It is certain we have no Evidence to the contrary, nor any Authorities to prove it an uniform and uninterrupted Practice : If therefore we have no Authors who testify this to be matter of Fact, I shall beg leave to tell this Writer, it is not very reasonable to expect that we should concede this Point.

Tho' after all, should we for Argument sake put the Case, that it was the universal and constant Practice of the Church, yet without it can be prov'd to be commanded by our Saviour, it will not appear to be more necessary, and essential than the *Osculum Sanctum*, the Use of *Incense*, and *Aqua Benedicta*, and several other Rites which have been as universally and constantly practic'd, and as much enjoin'd as the Mixture of Water in the Eucharistick Cup.

Our Author says, that the various Reasons assign'd for the Mixture, shew the Necessity of it, and point out the Essentiality of the Practice ; but he is not

E

so

So kind as to tell us how they do it. For my own part, I think the Variety of the Reasons assign'd for the Mixture, is a very strong Argument against his Cause, without he can prove, that it is Essential to the Sacrament, to make use of all those mystical Significations which were assign'd as the Reasons of the Mixture.

One Church assign'd as a Reason for it such a Mystery, Another in a different Age, a Mystery of a quite different Signification : So that the Reason which induc'd One Church and Age to mix the Cup, was no Reason in Others, who built their Practice upon quite different mystical Significations.

But our Antagonist says, *How doth the Author of the NO NECESSITY know, but they agreed also in their Reasons for this Usage.* By the Rules of Disputation, He ought to prove there was such an Agreement ; for till there is Evidence brought to prove a Matter of Fact, We fairly conclude that there was no such Thing done. And could our Author have prov'd such an Agreement, He needed not to have ask'd for a Proof, that there was no such Thing. However to please this froward Gentleman, We will shew, that it was impossible there should be such an Agreement in the Reasons for the Mixture : Because the Reasons assign'd for it were forg'd in different Ages, as well as distant Places. One Age assign'd such a Mystery as the Reason of their Usage, the next Age produces a new Mystery, which was not thought of before, and consequently could not be agreed to, as the Reason of their Usage of it. And for a long time there was no Church, as we know of, that regarded any of these Mystical Significations : All which is a plain Proof, that the Mixture of Water was no more than a voluntary Rite, and not the proper Matter of the Sacrament. But it seems this Author thinks, *This Argument will as well conclude against the Wine as the Water ; for the Wine is made by one Church, to signify the Divine Nature of Christ, by Another the Blood, or Human Nature ; which Variety of Reason according to this Writer's way of arguing* (o)
(meaning

(meaning the Author of the No Necessity) is a plain Evidence, that they did not think the *Wine Essential*.

With this Writer's leave, I think there is a vast difference in the Case; for there is no Church which ever made Wine to signify the Divine Nature of Christ, which did not at the same Time intend to represent his Blood or Human Nature, nor indeed did the Church ever make Wine to signify either. For it was our Saviour that commanded his Church to represent himself under the Symbols of Bread and Wine. This Mysterious Representation, is not a Voluntary of the Church; We don't make use of Wine, to signify the Blood of Christ upon her Authority, but upon the positive Command of Christ, who said; **THIS IS MY BLOOD**: Whereas, on the other Hand, the Mysteries which were signified by the *Water*, were not stamp'd with the same Authority, they were not so much as heard of, till many Years after the Apostolical Age, their Being depended upon the Pleasure of the several Churches that form'd them; the Sacrament is effectual to all the Purposes, our Saviour design'd it without them. And to make it a Parallel Case, we must suppose a Body of Christians, who make use of Wine for no other Reason, than to signify some Mysteries not commanded by Christ, nor stamp'd with any better Authority, than those signified by the Water, and if he can produce such a Case, then it will appear evident, that such Persons do not think the Wine essential. For if the Mysteries which they make the only Reason of their using Wine, be not Essential, consequently they can't think the Wine so.

Thus we may plainly see, that the various Reasons which supported the Practice of the Mixture, are a plain Proof that it is not Essential to the Sacrament, nor the Command of Christ, but a mere Humane Institution; and consequently alterable at the Pleasure of the Church.

Our Author is here pinch'd so close, that he is forc'd to leave the Argument, and betake himself to his old Method of shuffling. He can't pretend to prove that the Mysteries which supported the Use

of Water were Essential to the Sacrament, and therefore he says. " However, whether any or all of the
 " different Churches were mistaken in the Signifi-
 " cation of the Mystery or not, We have no Reason
 " to suppose them mistaken in the Fact; *Viz.* That
 " the Mixture was our Lord's Institution".

Our Dispute is not, whether these Churches were mistaken in their Significations of the Mystery, nor whether they had a right to institute these Mystical Significations. They might be very useful means of Instruction to those illiterate Ages who had not the Advantage of printed Books, nor several other Helps which we have now-a-days: But our Argument is, that these Mysteries were the only Reason which was given for the use of Water; these were the only Support of the Practice in most Churches; and the Mysteries not being Essential and Necessary, it is a plain Proof, that those who built this Custom upon them, did not think it necessary, or the Institution of our Saviour. The Merits of the Cause depend upon this Question: *Whether Water is Part of that Matter which our Saviour instituted as the Representative of his Blood?* On our Parts we have prov'd it a common Opinion of the Fathers, that Wine alone was the proper Matter of the Cup, and that the Reasons which were given for the use of Water, demonstrate, that it was not thought Essential. Whereas on the other Hand, there has not been one Evidence of any Authority in the Church produc'd, which proves Water to be any more than a Rite, that depends upon the Pleasure of the Churches that use it. For the first three Centuries, we can find no more than four Authors who can be pretended to mention the Practice, consequently we can have no Evidence that it was the constant and uninterrupted Usage of the Church. *Justin Martyr*, who liv'd in the Second Century, is the First that gives any Account of it; and he barely relates it as the Practice of the Church in those Parts, without giving us the least Intimation that it was the Institution of our Saviour: Nay, we may fairly conclude, from several Passages of this Father's Works, that he thought Wine was the very
 Matter

Matter that represented Christ's Blood. For explaining that Passage in *Genesis* 49. v. 11. *He shall wash his Garments in Wine, and his Cloaths in the Blood of the Grape*, He tells us ; That hereby is signified, that those that believe in Christ should be washed in his Blood. For the Holy Spirit, by Christ's Garments signified the People, who should receive Remission of their Sins by him. And by the Blood of the Grape, was signified the Blood of Christ (p).

As for *Irenæus*, He hath not said one Word of *Water* being mix'd with *Wine* in the sacred Cup. *Mixtus Calix, Mixtura*, and such like Expressions, don't signify the Mixture of *Wine* and *Water*, but any Liquor pour'd into the Cup. However should we grant, that he intended a Mixture of *Water* and *Wine* by these Phrases, yet it will do our Antagonist's Cause no Service, without he can bring some Proof, that he thought *Water* one part of the Matter of the Eucharistick Cup. For we don't deny the *Wine* when mixt, upon a due Consecration, to be the Representative Blood of Christ, and this is all that the Citation from this Father proves, should we admit our Author's Constructions to be Just.

As for *Clemens Alexandrinus*, He is so far from being favourable to our Author's Opinion, That he in plain Terms contradicts it : For he tells us, *That the Blood of Christ, is (represented by) the Blood of the Grape, and that the Matter which he Consecrated was Wine, and that the Scripture says, that WINE was the mystical Sign or Representation of his Blood.* All which plainly demonstrate, that the dark Passages which our Author has cited from this Father, is nothing to his Purpose.

And lastly, *St. Cyprian* who is the only Author we know of for three hundred Years, that recommends
the

(p) Πλυνεῖ ἐν οἴνῳ τὴν σὺλὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν αἵματι σατυλῆς τὴν περικλυμένην αὐτοῦ. Τὸ τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ ἀππλύνειν μέλλειν τοὺς πεινῶντας αὐτῷ ἐδύλατο· σὺλὴν γὰρ αὐτὸ ἐκάλεισε τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τὰς δὲ αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν λαβόντας. — Τὸ δὲ αἷμα τῆς σατυλῆς ἐπέην τὸ λόγον, διὰ τὴν τέχνην διδύλωκεν, ὅτι αἷμα μὲν ἔχει ὁ χριστός. *Dialog. cum Tryphon. Judæo, Pag. 273. Edit. Paris. Anno 1636. Vide etiam P. 301. & Apolog. 2. P. 74.*

the Usage by any Argument, He clearly answers the Question in Dispute, for he positively asserts, in so many Terms, that the Blood of Christ is *not Water but Wine*.

And this is all that we need to contend for, in the Defence of the *Church of England* : For if Water is not any part of the Matter that represents Christ's Blood, it can be no more than a circumstantial Rite or Custom, and consequently not Essential to the Sacrament. We grant, that he warmly pleads for the Usage, because it contain'd somemystical Significations, but then if the Observation of these Mysteries are not necessary, (which our Author is pleas'd to grant,) it is plain, that the Water, which was insisted on, for no other Purpose than to keep up these Mysteries, can't be Essential.

I shall offer one Argument more, which I think sufficient of it self to prove, that Wine was esteem'd by the Church, the only proper Matter of the Cup. What our Saviour instituted, he call'd the *Fruit of the Vine*. Now if it can be prov'd, that the *Fruit of the Vine* was commonly understood to signify no more than *Wine*, then it will appear that *Wine* only was thought the Matter of the Cup.

Clemens Alexandrinus proving against the *Encratites*, that our Saviour drank Wine gives several Instances of it ; and one Instance was this : *Our Saviour shew'd that what was CONSECRATED WAS WINE*, saying to his Disciples, *I WON'T DRINK OF THE FRUIT OF THIS WINE*, until I drink it with you in my Father's Kingdom (q). Here the Father interprets the *Fruit of the Vine*, and makes it an Argument, to prove that the Matter of the Eucharistick Cup, τὸ εὐλογῆδὲν was really Wine.

St. Chrysostom is home to our Purpose ; our Saviour us'd Wine, of the *Fruit of the Vine*, said he : *Now the Vine produces Wine not Water* (r). Here the Father plainly

(q) Ὅτι ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἦν τὸ εὐλογῆδὲν, ἀπέδειξε πάλιν, πρὸς τὰς μαθητὰς λέγων· Οὐ μὲν πῶς ἐκ τῆς γεννήματός τ' ἀμπέλου ταύτης, &c. *Pædagog. Lib. II. P. 158.*

(r) Οἶνον ἐπέχρητο, ἐκ τῆς γεννήματός, εἴπῃ, τῆς ἀμπέλου, ἢ ἀμπέλους ὁ δὲ θεὸς, ὅτι ὕδωρ γέννα. *Homil. in Mat. 26.*

plainly intimates that the *Fruit of the Vine*; signifies *Wine*, not *Wine and Water*.

Theodoret tells us in so many Words, that the *Fruit of the Vine*, is call'd *Wine* (s). To these I might add many more Fathers, from whose Writings we might fairly conclude, that they did not think the *Fruit of the Vine* signified any thing more than *Wine*. Whereas our Author and his Abettors are not able to produce one Instance, where a Father says, that the *Fruit of the Vine* signifies *Wine and Water*. The only Evidence which is brought to prove, that *Wine* when mingled with *Water* is call'd the *Fruit of the Vine* is the *Jewish Talmud*, a Book compos'd long after our Saviour's Time, unknown by most of the Fathers, and stuff'd with a world of Impertinencies and Falsities. We need not concern our selves, whether the Jews might pertinently call mingled *Wine* the *Fruit of the Vine*, and therefore I shall pass by the trifling Vindication of the Talmudical Distinction of the *Fruit of the Vine* and the *Fruit of the Tree*. For the *Jewish Talmud* calling *Wine* with *Water* the *Fruit of the Vine*, is no Proof, that our Saviour meant so by this Phrase. And all that can be pretended to be prov'd from hence is, that the Jews at the Time of composing the *Talmud* meant so much. But it no ways proves, that the Jews in our Saviour's Time, call'd *Wine and Water* the *Fruit of the Vine*. This is what should be prov'd to make it probable, that our Saviour design'd the Mixture by this Phrase; for it may be that the Jews might take up this way of speaking long after the Death of our Saviour and his Apostles. Besides we are to consider, that few of the Fathers were acquainted with the Custom and Phraseology of the Jews, most of them were Converts from Gentilisme, and consequently Strangers to the Jewish Usages; and every one of them cited for the Mixture, made use of the *Greek Version*; which plainly shews that they were not well Skill'd in the *Hebrew Language*: So that should we suppose, that the Jews before the Composing of the *Talmud*, did signify *Wine* mingled with *Water* by the *Fruit*
of

(e) 'Ο ὅ τ' ἀμπέλαι καρπὸς, οὐκ ὡς ποτὶ γόρυνε. Dialog. I. Vol. IV.

of the *Vine*, yet since these Fathers were unacquainted with their Language, it is plain they did not understand it so, because the genuine and obvious Meaning of the *Fruit of the Vine* can be nothing but *Wine*.

In short, if the Fruit of the Vine is the proper Matter of the Cup, and the Father's did mean no more by this *Pbrase* than *Wine*, then I think it plainly appears that they did not think Water Essential to the Sacrament, but a mere voluntary Usage or indifferent Rite.

The Reverend and Learned Mr. *Collier* tells us from *Platina* ; " That Pope *Alexander*, who instituted Holy Water, was the Person who instituted that Water should be mingled with Wine, to signify the Union of Christ and his Church (t). The Words of *Platina*, from whom that great Author gives us this Account, runs thus. " He also order'd Water to be mix'd with the Wine, at the Consecration of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ ; by which is signified the Union of Christ and the Church : He also order'd, that the Oblation should be made of unleaven'd Bread, and not of leaven'd Bread, as he commanded before " (u).

Sigebert in his *Chronicon* (w), likewise informs us ; " That Pope *Alexander*, who appointed Water to be bless'd and sprinkled, and Oyl to be bless'd Annually &c. was the Person, who instituted Water to be mix'd with Wine at the Sacrament.

Gratian (x), *Martin Polonus* (y), and *Barlaam* (z) likewise tells us, " That this Pope was the first, that instituted Water to be mix'd with Wine.

In short, it plainly appears from all Quarters, that Water was not the proper Matter of the Eucharistick Cup, but a voluntary Usage or Rite instituted by humane Authority, and consequently it ought

(t) See *Alexander* 1. in *Collier's* Dictionary.

(u) Voluit quoque aquam admisceri Vino in Consecratione Corporis & Sanguinis Jesu Christi ; quo significatur Christum Ecclesiæ conjunctum esse, &c. *Platina de Vir. Pontif.*

(w) Apud Bibliothec. Patrum.

(x) Decret. pars 3 Distinct. 2.

(y) *Chronicon* ad Annum 132.

(z) *Epistolæ de Unione utriusque Ecclesiæ.*

ought to be reckon'd *inter ἀδιάφορα* among the things that are indifferent.

The next Point in Dispute, is the Necessity of Prayers for the Dead, at the Eucharistick Service.

The first Evidence cited for the Antiquity of this Usage is *Tertullian*, the Passage is this : *Oblationes pro defunctis, pro Natalitiis annuo die facimus* : Which has been worn thread-bare by the Papists, in Defence of Masses for the Dead. And were the Translation of the *Author of the Reasons* just, it would be a strong Proof, that *Tertullian* did intend nothing less than Masses for the Dead: For he construes the Words, thus ; *They mention'd the Names of the Deceased in the Prayers of the Eucharistick Sacrifice*. The Translation indeed, doth scarce answer so much as in one Word to the Original, but it answers all the Intents and Purposes of the Mass-mongers. For what else is meant by saying Masses for the Dead, but mentioning the Names of the Deceased in the Eucharistick Sacrifice ? What else do the *Romanists* mean by the Word Mass, than the Eucharistick Sacrifice ? Nay, are not the Canon of the Mass, and the Communion Service Synonymous Terms ? The Author of the *No Necessity* therefore prov'd, that *Tertullian* did not in this Passage favour the saying of Masses for the Dead, or which is all one, *the mentioning the Names of the Deceas'd in the Eucharistick Sacrifice*. For the genuine Translation of, *Oblationes pro defunctis facimus*, runs thus ; We make Offerings for the Deceased : 'Tis probable, that these Offerings, were Gifts or Legacies given to the Church or Poor, and it may be the very same, as the Deceased us'd to give upon the Anniversary of their Birth. For it was customary among the Ancients to make Presents on their Birth-day ; and *Tertullian* seems to intimate, that the Christians Annually made pious or charitable Gifts upon the Anniversary of their Death, in the room of those that were given upon the Anniversary of their Birth. Can our Author deny, that *pro Natalitiis*, may be construed in the Room of Birth-Day Presents (a) ? Is it unusual, or only a Modern Practice

F

Practice

(a) *Dat Natal'ia in Hortis. Cicero.*

practice to make pious and charitable distributions upon the Anniversary of our Death. For any thing our Author can say against it, the Loaves &c. distributed by the Church Wardens of most Parishes, fully answer the Oblations which *Tertullian* says, were made by the Christians in his Time for the Dead. This Writer indeed tells us, that *this Construction has not the least countenance from any Ecclesiastical Writer, and that it is contrary to the plain Language of the ancient Church*, for *Oblatio*, *Deprecatio* & *Sacrificium* are synonymous Terms (b). But here he only betrays his Ignorance, and shews, that he is not acquainted with Ecclesiastical Writers : For tho' *Oblatio* has been sometimes us'd, *pro Missa*, or *Sacrificio*, yet *Oblationes* very rarely signify any thing else, than the Offerings which were made for the Service of the Clergy, or Poor. *St. Paul* uses the Phrase of *Tertullian* in this very Sense : *I came to bring my Alms to my Nation, and Oblations* (c). In the Original it is, *I came to make my Oblations* : I hope our Author won't say that these Oblations signify *Deprecationes* & *Sacrificia*, Deprecations and Sacrifices. A moderate Share of Knowledge in the ancient Oeconomy of the Church, will furnish him with innumerable Instances of the Offerings made by the Faithful, for the Support of the Church and Poor. The ancient Office of the *Oblatorij* was to collect these Oblations ; and that early Office of the *Oeconomi*, or Church Stewards, was erected to take care of them (d). In those Times the Offerings of the Faithful were the only Support of the Church and Poor ; they had not those kind Provisions then for their Maintenance, as the later Ages have afforded ;

(b) *Necessity*, p. 85.

(c) Παρεργασίαν ἐλεημοσύνας ποιήσων εἰς τὸ ἔθνός μου, καὶ προσφορὰς. Acts 24. 17.

(d) Versabatur circa fidelium Oblationes Ecclesiæ factas, & bona ejus temporalia. Morinus de Sacris Ordinatio. pars 3. Exerc. 16. Cap. 5.

forded ; and therefore we have frequent Mention, in the ancient Canons, of the Oblations of Fruits, Milk, Honey, &c. for the Service of the Clergy ; and tho' the Reason of the thing has discontinued this Custom, yet most Churches keep up the Practice of offering Money upon several Occasions.

Our Author (e) pretends to tell us, that *Tertullian* has elsewhere explain'd his Meaning of *Oblatio pro defunctis* ; and that he speaks clearly of the Priests offering Sacrifices for the Dead. For my own Part, I must confess I can't see any thing like it, unless Laymen, and Women are Priests. For these are the only Persons which *Tertullian* supposes to make Oblations for the Dead. *Tertullian* exhorts his Lay-Friend to Chastity, and inveighs against second Marriages as unlawful and adulterous (an Error, by the way, which he suck'd from the Montanists.) One Argument to establish this Error, is the Passage quoted by this Writer, which being fairly translated, runs thus : *For you can't hate your former Wife for whom you reserve a more Religious Affection, as being now receiv'd with the Lord : For whose Spirit you pray, for whom you GIVE ANNUAL OFFERINGS. Will you therefore stand before the Lord with as many Wives as you commemorate in Prayer ? And will you offer for Two (f) ?* Thus far we are secure, that *Tertullian* doth not speak of offering Sacrifices for the Dead : For *Annua Oblationes reddis ; thou givest Annual Offerings*, is spoken to the Person of a Layman. Now I hope our Author won't say that a Layman may consecrate, or offer the Eucharistick Sacrifice. 'Tis the Husband that prays for the Wife, and not the Priest ; and I am apt to think a Lay-Husband was not permitted to say

F 2

these

(e) *Necessity*, p. 86.

(f) *Neque enim Pristinam poteris odisse, cui etiam religiosiorem reservas affectionem, ut Jam receptæ apud Dominum, pro cuius Spiritu postulas, pro qua oblationes annuas reddis, & commendabis illas duas per Sacerdotem de Monogamiâ ordinatum ? Aut etiam de Virginitate sancitum, circumdatum Virginibus ac Univiris ? De Exhort ad Castitat. C. 11.*

these Prayers publickly in the Church. And elsewhere *Tertullian* speaks of the Wife's praying for her Husband's Soul, and making Annually Offerings upon the Day of his Death (g); but I don't find the least mention of the Priest's offering Sacrifices for the Dead in any Part of his Writings. And if this be the Case, I think it is plain, that there is nothing in the forecited Passage, which makes against our Interpretation of *Oblationes facimus*.

However, if this won't do, our Author thinks he has another Passage that effectually serves his purpose, and proves that the Commemoration and Oblation was made by the Priest; *Et Commendabis illas duas per Sacerdotem*. Had our Author given us the whole Sentence, and turn'd it into *English*, I am apt to think he would have found few of his Opinion. *For wilt thou commend those two (Wives) don't signifie, wilt thou procure a Priest to offer Sacrifice for them.* It is more probable that it relates to a Panegyricall Oration, spoken by the Priest, something like our Funeral Sermons, where the Virtues of the Deceas'd are usually display'd to the best Advantage; and that this is not a groundless Conjecture will appear to any one who considers the whole Sentence, *Et commendabis illas duas per Sacerdotem de Monogamiâ ordinatum, aut etiam de Virginitate Sancitum, cirtundatum Virginibus ac Univirsis*. Wilt thou commend these two by a Priest, who at his Ordination was a Monogamist, or a profest Virgin, whose Congregation consists of Virgins, or Women that have but one Husband. The other Readings which we meet with in most Editions, before this of *Regaltius*, seem to confirm our Opinion; for they seem to refer to a Montanistical Order or Custom, for the Priest's making an Encomium upon Monogamy.

But after all, supposing that *Tertullian* really meant by *Oblationes*, what this Writer says, (*viz.*) A recommending of the deceased in the *Eucharistical* Service, and this is all that the Papists mean by saying *MASS* for the Dead; yet it doth not appear, that he
thought

(g) Vid. Lib. de Monogamiâ, C. 10 & 11.

thought this Practice more necessary than the Trine Immersion in Baptism, the taking of Milk and Honey after it, and several other useless Customs that stand upon the same foot.

This our Author says, is more than the Author of the *No Necessity* has attempted to prove (b). Here I shall only ask this Writer, How it can appear, that *Tertullian* thought so, unless he had convey'd these Thoughts to us by his Writings. And he would do well to shew us in what parts of of his Works it appears he did think so. What ever *Tertullian* meant by *Oblationes pro Defunctis*, it is evident that he puts the Practice upon a Level with many other unnecessary Usages, he recommends one Custom no more than another; nay, he tells us, That all these Customs relate to the Discipline of the Church, and stand upon the same Authority. If you (says he) enquire for a Law in Scripture for these and other parts of Discipline of the same Nature, you will find none for them. The Authority pretended for them is Tradition, Custom is pleaded for confirming them, and the Credit of our Ancestors is the reason of our observing them (i).

However, if *Tertullian* doth not say, that the recommending the Dead in the Eucharistick Service is more necessary than the Trine Immersion, &c. yet this Writer pretends he can easily demonstrate that he thought so: For, the Trine Immersion is nothing but a Ceremony attending the Administration of Baptism; but the Offering for the Dead is an Act of Charity and Communion, of the Substance of Religion, and essential to the Eucharistical Administration.

This Writer has already told us, That this is the Sense of his own Party: And indeed they have no other Pretence for their Schism. But where has *Tertullian* said any thing like it? In what part of his Works

(b) Necessary Page 89.

(i) Harum & aliarum ejusmodi Disciplinarum, si legem expostulas Scripturarum nullam invenies, Traditio tibi prætendetur auctrix, Consuetudo confirmatrix, & fides observatrix. *De Coron. Milit. Cap. 5. Sect. 4.*

Works can we find any Passage that gives Countenance to this Opinion? I am satisfied he may as soon prove it from *Tully*, as from *Tertullian*. 'Tis granted, that when *Tertullian* deserted the Church, he countenances Prayers for the Dead (*k*): But then the matter of these Prayers, I believe, is agreeable to the Sentiments of few, if any, of our Author's Party. They were not the Publick Prayers of the Church said by the Priest, but private Petitions as has been already prov'd; and this our Author and his Adherents may do, tho' the matter of them should be never so whimsical: For no-body, as I know of, will call them to an account for what they do quietly in their Closets.

Against the Testimony of *St. Cyprian* this Writer says, The Author of the *No Necessity* has nothing to object, but only that he did not think it absolutely necessary to pray for the Dead at the Eucharistick Sacrifice. How? Nothing to object against this Father's Testimony for our Author's Sentiments, when he himself (*l*) takes notice of the Objection made by the Author of the *No Necessity* (*m*), and scribbles some Pages to no purpose against it. The Case is plainly denied by that Author, and he only says, Supposing that *St. Cyprian* really meant that the Soul of *Victor* should not be pray'd for at the Holy Altar, yet this would not make it appear that he thought it absolutely necessary always to pray for the Dead, at the Eucharistick Sacrifice. Our Author, in answer to this, tells us, *That this Father's Practice shews his Opinion of the Necessity of it.* This Argument was obviated by the Author of *No Necessity*: For, says he, granting it (for Argument sake) the Custom of that Time, yet without it can be prov'd that *St. Cyprian* thought all the

(*k*) Exhort. ad Castitat. Cap. 11. Lib. de Animâ, Cap. 58. Lib. de Monogamiâ, Cap. 10. & 11. All which Books were written upon Montanistical Principles.

(*l*) Necessity, Pag. 94.

(*m*) No Necessity, Pag. 29.

the Customs that were us'd in the *African Church* were indispensably necessary to all other Churches afterwards, his Practice won't come up to the purpose. Here our Author replies, *Why all the African Customs? Is there no difference* (says he) *between a Ceremony and the Substance of Religion? Betwveen a Disciplinary Provision, and a constituent part of the Christian Religion.* Yes certainly, there is a wide Difference between them; but where has St. Cyprian told us, that the Eucharistical Offerings for the Dead are the Substance of Religion, and a constituent part of Christianity? Has this Writer or any other Author before him pretended to quote any Passage out of this Father that tends to this purpose.

The Author of the *No Necessity*, to drive on the Argument further, says, Supposing St. Cyprian did think it necessary to pray for the Dead at the Eucharistick Sacrifice, yet this doth not prove it to be so. Here this Writer wonders that *the Testimony of a Father of the Reputation and Antiquity of St. Cyprian should not be thought a sufficient Proof that this Practice was necessary.* If this Argument will hold, then I think it will prove that St. Cyprian and all the ancient and famous Fathers were infallible, a Notion too absurd to need any Confutation. However, here is a Reason given by this Writer, why he must be infallible in this point; because *the Martyr himself flourish'd within an hundred and fifty Years of the time of St. John; and yet he appeals to a Decree of his Ancestors, which excludes all such as should nominate Clergy-men for their Executors, from the Oblation for the Departed.*

Well, granting the new Birth of this Martyr to be within an hundred and fifty Years of St. *John's* Death; yet what doth this wonderful Discovery make to his Purpose? For doth he appeal to any pretended Tradition from St. *John* relating to this matter? Doth he any ways insinuate that this Disciple was of Opinion, that whoever appointed a Clergy-man an Executor, should not be pray'd for at the Altar? What is this but to cast a Mist before the Eyes of the less understanding Reader? And again, Doth St. Cyprian appeal to the
Decree

Decree of his Ancestors, for the NECESSITY of offering Sacrifices for the Dead? I thought the Decree was made against making a Clergy-man Executor, which is only a matter of DISCIPLINE, and widely different from a CONCILIARY DECLARATION, *That offering Sacrifices for the Dead is an Article of Faith, and an essential and necessary part of Christianity.* All this Writer and his Assistants can prove, is, that St. Cyprian flourish'd *Anno Dom.* 248. and that he appeals to a Vote of some Bishops, made before that Time (but, for ought we know, not two Years) against any one's appointing a Clergy-man Executor or Trustee, under the Penalty of losing some particular Honours that were then usually paid to the Memory of the Faithful deceas'd. This is the mighty Argument which this Writer brings to prove St. Cyprian, if he thought Prayers for the Dead necessary, must be infallible.

Against St. Cyprian's Infallibility, it was farther urg'd, Suppose St. Cyprian thought it necessary to give the Eucharist to Children, &c. yet this doth not prove the Thing to be necessary. Our Author replies to this, *That the Martyr thought the communicating Infants a necessary Practice, the Answerer has not attempted to prove. This Objection therefore (says he) must fall of course.*

If this Objection falls, all the Arguments us'd by our Antagonist and his Abettors will share the same Fate. For this Usage has every one of the same Arguments to plead for it, as has been made use of to prove the Necessity of those Points in the present Controversy. To turn the Tables then ; St. Cyprian must think the communicating of Infants to be necessary, because it is certain, it was not only the Custom of the *Africans* before his Time, but he himself relates a Miracle done while the Deacon was communicating a little Girl in the Place where he was celebrating the Eucharist (n). St. Cyprian's Practice is a Demonstration that he thought it lawful. If then St. Cyprian thought it a lawful Practice, our Author has more than
once

(n) Cypr. de Lapsis, pag. 132. Edit. Oxon.

once told us, he must think it necessary. Further, it is plain, that St. Cyprian thought the Practice useful; for to administer the Sacrament to no purpose, is certainly an abominable Profanation of it. If then he thought it useful by our Author's Logick, or new Art of thinking, he must think it necessary (o). And if he thought it necessary, without doubt it must be so; for the Testimony of a Father of the Reputation and Antiquity of St. Cyprian, a Martyr, that liv'd within less than an hundred and fifty Years of St. John's time, will over-balance a modern Practice, and out-weigh the Contradiction of these latter Ages (p).

To drive on a little further with our Author: The communicating Infants must be necessary, for it has Scripture for it, the same Text that this Writer cites for the Necessity of Prayers for the Dead (q). *A new Precept I give unto you, that you love one another*: And to use our Author's Words, can we *with-hold our Assistance* from our dear little Infants, *and at the same time extend our Love to them*? Besides, there is another Text which seems to make it more necessary to give the Communion to Infants, than to offer it for the Dead. *Unless ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you* (r). A Text frequently interpreted by some Fathers in favour of this old fashion'd Notion. Now the utmost that can be pretended by our Author, in offering Sacrifices for the Dead, is only to procure a more speedy Remission of Guilt, Refreshment and Peace for the Deceased; and should he and his Catholick Friends forget them, it would not be half so uncharitable as to neglect the poor Children who some Fathers have said could not be sav'd without receiving the Eucharist.

To go a little farther with our Author: The communicating of Infants must be necessary, because it was an ancient Practice, older than old *Tertullian*, and

G

con-

(o) Necessity Page 82.

(p) Necessity Pag. 92.

(q) Necessity, Pag. 82.

(r) John 6. 52.

consequently, according to our Author, as old as the Apostles. It was us'd in the Western Church till the eleventh or twelfth Century, and is still continued in the *Greek* and Eastern Churches. And to conclude with our Author, an Article of Faith looks concern'd in it, and the Communion of Saints, (s) can't be thoroughly answer'd without it; for they must be Saints, otherwise they could not be entitled to the Kingdom of God. Thus we may see that there is not one Argument which our Author brings to support the Necessity of sacrificing for the Dead, but what will as well serve to prove the Necessity of communicating of Infants.

But to return to *St. Cyprian*: The Author of the *No Necessity*, offer'd some Objections against this Father's being of the Opinion of this Writer's Party, and explain'd the so much boasted Passage in *St. Cyprian's* first Epistle to a Consistency with the Principles of the Church of *England*. *St. Cyprian* tells us, 'That in a Council of some Bishops (it is very likely this Council might be no more than a Convention of a few *Africans*) it was lately decreed, That no Man should name any of the Clergy to be an Executor or Trustee; and if any did this, there should be no Offerings made for him, nor Sacrifice celebrated on the account of his Death; for he doth not deserve to be nominated in the Prayers of the Priest at the Altar of God, who wilfully calls off the Priests from the Service of the Altar. And therefore, since *Victor*, contrary to the Decree LATELY made by the Synod, has presum'd to appoint *Geminus Faustinus*, who is a Priest to a Guardianship, you ought not to make any Offerings upon the account of his Death, or use any Prayers in the Church upon his account.' It was the Custom of this Time to inscribe the Names of the Faithful in the Diptychs (t) of the Church, which upon some certain Times

(s) *Necessity*, Pag. 94.

(t) The curious Reader may have a full Account of this Custom, and the Reason of it in the Learned *Mr. Dodwell's* Dissert. *Cyprian*. Dissert. 5. & Cardinal. Bona de Rebus Liturg. Cap. 14. & *Goar* Eucholog. Pag. 143.

times were recited, by the Deacon, at the Altar. The Friends of the Deceased used to make Offerings for them, as if they were alive upon the Anniversary of their Death, and sometimes to celebrate the Sacrament upon that Day, in respect to their Memory. Now *Victor* having condemn'd the Synod's Decree, *St. Cyprian*, who was very warm for the Discipline of the Church, orders that the usual Honours and Respects that were paid to the Memory of the faithful Deceased, should not be given to him.

That *St. Cyprian* did not think, that offering Sacrifice was propitiatory, or any ways serviceable to the Dead, is very plain from his Notion of the State of the Departed : For he supposes the Souls of the Righteous to pass immediately to Heaven, (*u*) and to enjoy the Presence and Favour of God, as may be seen in several Parts of his Works. Now if these pious Souls are encircled with so much Bliss ; to what purpose could he propose to pray for their Relief and Refreshment ? What Service, what Advantage could he give them by offering Expiatory Sacrifices ? Doth Heaven need Refreshment, Peace and Rest ? Or can a glorified Saint want our Assistance ? When therefore *St. Cyprian* speaks of Offerings, Sacrifices, and Commemorations for the Dead, it is plain he doth not mean they should be made with the Design to advantage their State, and better their Condition : No, they were design'd for the Benefit of the Living, and the Solemnizing them upon the Anniversary of their Death, was no more than a pious Regard and Honour that they paid to their Memories. It was a sort of Congratulation to their heavenly Birth-Day. It was a Testimony of their grateful Sense of the Advantages they receiv'd by their useful Lives, and holy Examples, &c. Besides, it is probable upon these Anniversaries, the Virtues of those who were commemorated,

G 2

were

(*u*) Beati satis qui ex Vobis — Jam de Seculo recesserunt, confectoque Itinere Virtutis ac fidei ad complexum & osculum Domini, Domino ipso gaudente Venerunt. *Cypr. Epist.* 37. p. 73.

were recited, (w) at least there was some honourable Mention made of them, which naturally rais'd some affecting Ideas in the Minds of the Survivors. Here special Prayers were offer'd up to God, that they might be enabled to follow the bright Examples of those whom they thus commemorated; and here the Sacrifices of Praise and Thanksgiving were offer'd with a more than ordinary Devotion to God for those Worthies, from whom they had received so much Advantage. There is a vast difference between respectful Remembrances of the Dead, between Eucharistical Commemorations, and Propitiatory Sacrifices in their behalf. The first St. Cyprian design'd when he speaks of *Commemorationes, Oblationes, & Sacrificia pro Martyribus, &c.* But it is highly improbable, that he should mean the latter; for he supposes that Martyrdom (which he calls a Second Baptism) washes away all Sins, and immediately wafts our Souls into the blissful Presence of God (x). Now what occasion could there be to offer Expiatory Sacrifices for those pious Souls, who had no remaining Guilt to be atton'd for? What Service could a Propitiatory Oblation be to those Spirits whom the Angels had securely convey'd into the Divine Presence, into Fulness of Joy, &c. In short, it is very plain that St. Cyprian did not think such Prayers, &c. as our Author contends for, were serviceable to the Dead, or a necessary Duty incumbent on the Living. 'As the Lord finds you, says he, when he calls you from hence, so shall you be at the Day of Judgment: When you depart this World, there is no Place for Repentance, no Satisfaction to be made. Here you either lose or obtain Life; here you must provide for your Eternal Salvation, by the Worship of God, and the Fruit of Faith. As long as a Man remains in the World, repentance is not too late. Ask Pardon, tho' at the last Moments of your Life, &c. Pardon is granted, &c.

(w) *Martyrum Passiones, & dies Anniversariâ commemoratione celebrantur.* Cyp. *Epist.* 39.

(x) *De Exhort. Martyrij.*

‘ *Ec.* and you pass from the very Moment of your Death to a State of Immortality (y). All which Passages plainly prove, that St. *Cyprian* thought the State of the Dead, ’till the Day of Judgment, unalterable, and consequently there can be no occasion for any Prayers and Sacrifices in their behalf.

The *Apostolical Constitutions*, our Author tells us, are the next that bear Testimony to the ancient Usage of praying for the Dead. All that this Writer can mean here, is, that Prayers for the Dead are as ancient as the *Apostolical Constitutions*: And what is this to the Purpose, without he can prove that all the Usages mention’d in this spurious Work are necessary; a Task which I am sure neither he nor his Abettors will ever attempt to undertake.

Against the Testimony of St. *James*, Bishop of *Nisibis*, our Author says, it is objected, 1st, That it relates only to private Prayers: And, 2^{dly}, That *Valesius* gives incontestable Proofs against the Credit of *Theodore*, in relation to some Miracles done by *Nisibensis*. Here this Writer industriously clouds the true State of the Case. We shall therefore put it into a little clearer Light.

The Author of the *Reasons* attempted to prove the Necessity of restoring Prayers for the Dead; Because St. *James*, Bishop of *Nisibis*, who made part of the Council of *Nice*, and was famous for working Miracles, pray’d for a dead Person, that God would pardon his Sins, and admit him into the Company of the Just (z). To this it was replied, These Prayers were not read from any Liturgy. 2^{dly}, That this Bishop pray’d for some dead Men

(y) Qualem te invenit Dominus cum vocat talem pariter & Judicat. De Mortalit. p. 163.

Quando istinc excessum fuerit nullus Jam penitentiae locus est, nullus Satisfactionis effectus; hic vita aut amittitur, aut tenetur hic salutem aeternae cultu Dei, & fructu fidei providetur— In isto adhuc mundo remanenti penitentia nulla sera est — Tu sub ipso licet exitu, & vitae temporalis occasu, pro delictis roges — Venia confitenti datur— Et ad immortalitatem sub ipsa morte transitor. Cyp. ad Demetrianum, p. 196.

(z) *Reasons for restoring*, p. 13.

Men to be restor'd to Life. And, 3dly, It was prov'd he was no Miracle-Monger. And, 4thly, That we have had as Orthodox and Holy Men, as he on the other side of the Question (a). All which Objections sufficiently cramp the Arguments which were drawn from *Nisibensis*. To come then to our Author; *It is objected against the Testimony of Nisibensis, that it only relates to private Prayer. To this, says he, I answer, Nisibensis could not pray for a dead Person, unless he had thought it a lawful Practice. And I have before prov'd it can't be lawful, and not necessary; but if it be necessary that Necessity must result from the Nature of Communion, and must consequently make it of publick Obligation.* Our Dispute is not whether *Nisibensis* thought it lawful to pray for his dead Friends in his Closet: We suppose that good Man would not do what he thought unlawful; but then we can't believe he was so ill a Logician, as to think with this Writer, that every thing that is lawful is absolutely necessary; so that the other Argument must fall of course. It was urg'd, that this Father pray'd for some dead Person to be restor'd to Life: It is plain he thought it lawful to do so; but if he thought it necessary, I hope this Writer won't think his Authority sufficient to introduce this Practice into the Church.

As to the Miracles said to be done by this Saint, believe them who will; they have no Influence upon the Merits of the Cause, and therefore we shall not trouble the Reader with a Confutation of the Evidences pretended for them.

The Practice of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Ambrose, Epiphanius, St. Chrysostom and St. Austin were urg'd to prove the Necessity of Prayers for the Dead. To this it was answered, if the Author of the Reasons can prove it necessary to restore all the Usages of these Holy Men, we own he has gain'd his Point. And what says our Author to this? Why truly, *This Objection is foreign to the Purpose, unless Usage and Evidence be the same; for they were cited chiefly for Testimony.*

What

(a) No Necessity, p. 29 and 30.

What this Writer means by this Jargon, I can't well tell. It is certain the Author of the *Reasons and Defence*, suppos'd the Usage of these Fathers an Evidence for the *Necessity of Prayers for the Dead*, or else he must produce them to no purpose. Doth not his Argument run thus; St. Cyril &c. prayed for the Dead, *Ergo* their Practice is an Evidence for the Necessity of these Prayers: So that Usage and Evidence were made the same by this Writers Patron, and if he will but look into the *No Necessity*, he will find it fully prov'd, that the Usage of these Fathers were not sufficient Evidences for the Necessity of them.

Our Author goes on, *St. Cyril is declared to report, that 'twas the Custom of the Church to pray for all the Faithful Deceased in the Communion Service.* Here I must tell this Writer that this is a false Report: For St. Cyril doth not say it was the Custom of the Church, nor did he himself pray for all the Faithful departed. For he doth not pray for the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles and Martyrs, but he desires that their Prayers may be heard for him. *After we have offer'd this Sacrifice,* says he, *We make mention also of those who have slept before us. First of all, of the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles and Martyrs; that God would by their Intercession and Deprecations receive our Prayers. Afterwards, We pray for the Holy Fathers and Bishops deceas'd, and last of all we pray for all who were among us when they departed this Life; believing that the Prayer which is offer'd for them, when the Holy and Tremendous Sacrifice lies upon the Altar; to be a very great help to their Souls, which we are ready to demonstrate to you by an Example. For I know (says the Father) that there are many that say; What Advantage will it be to the Soul of a Person that goes out of the World in his Sins, to make mention of him, at this Sacrifice (b).*

This Father doth not intimate, that the whole Church pray'd for the Dead; nor doth he himself pray for all the Faithful departed, unless our Author will exclude the Apostles and Martyrs out of the Catalogue

(b) Catachel. Mystagog. 5.

talogue. These he mentions only as Intercessors, that were to be serviceable to us, and supposes that they are to pray for us, and not we for them. He indeed prays for some holy Fathers and Bishops; but what Advantage he design'd them by it, he doth not tell us. And as to the others which he prays for, these he supposes to be in some Place like the Popish Purgatory, a Notion, by the way, too much encourag'd in the fourth Century, tho' as this Father himself informs us, it was oppos'd by many. And lastly, He doth not tell us that we are commanded to pray for the Dead, but that he believes it serviceable to them; he gives it only as his own Opinion, which he grounds upon such a Reason, as will scarcely take with a modest Papist. Suppose, (says he,) a King to be offended by some of his Subjects, and to have driven them into Exile; and afterwards the Friends of those Persons to make a Crown, which they offer to him on behalf of those Exiles who lay under his Displeasure: Will he not remit some of their Punishment? In like manner when we pray for the Dead, notwithstanding they are Sinners, tho' we don't make a Crown; yet we offer Christ who was slain for our Sins, that we may render him who is most benign, propitious to our selves and them (c). Now if this Father's Logick is not good, and his Reasoning will not hold, (for he doth not pretend either Scripture, or Apostolical Tradition) then I think he is no formidable Enemy against the Church of England.

Against St. Ambrose it was objected, that the Prayers which is cited from him, was for one that died unbaptized. Now if the bare Practice of this Father, is a sufficient Evidence for the Necessity of Prayers for the Dead, then his Practice will recommend the Necessity of praying for those who die unbaptiz'd: For if his Example is an Authority sufficient to warrant one thing; I can't see any Reason, why it may not any other. And what doth our Author offer against the force of this Objection? Why truly, tho' the Emperour died without actual Baptism, yet he was resolv'd
and

(c) Ibid.

and prepar'd to receive it : *His want of Baptism was not his Fault.* Our Author will never be able to prove that an Intention to be baptiz'd is the same as an actual Baptism, or that it entitles to the same Rights, and Priveleges. Nor can he give us any Reason, for his saying that the want of Baptism was not his Fault ; For what hindred him from being baptiz'd for many Years before he was murder'd ? But it seems this Writer will justify any Error in Principle or Practice, that will but give a Colour to his own darling Opinion. Had *St. Ambrose's* Notion been defensible, all that our Author pretends to prove from hence, is, *that it was then the Practice of the Church to pray for the Dead.* Because *St. Ambrose would not have pray'd for the Dead, had it not been the Custom to do it.* What Service this will be to our Author's Opinion, I can't see, supposing his Logick to be good, *St. Ambrose pray'd for the Dead, and therefore the Church did so.* For if Prayers for the Dead must be necessary, because it was the usual Practice of the Church in the fourth Century, why then Incense, holy Water, *Oleum exorcitatum* and some other Things not YET demanded, must be necessary too, because they were the common Usages of most Churches at the same Time.

After all, *St. Ambrose* don't tell us, that Prayers for the Dead are necessary. Nay, he himself makes a doubt in the very Passage cited against us, whether they were serviceable or no. *I F,* says he, (speaking of the two Royal Brothers) *my Prayers will be of Service to you, both shall be happy : There shall no Day pass in which I will not mention you, nor will I say any Prayers in which I will not honour you, &c ** It seems, the Good Man was not of opinion, that his Prayers would certainly be of use to his departed Friends. However, if he could do them any Service by them, his Gratitude, and Affection to them was so great, that he would make a particular mention of them in every Address which he put up to God. He had a grateful Respect for their Memory, and therefore he would pray for them. And this he might do without founding it up-

H

on

* Ambros. in Obit. Valent.

on the Notion of a common Obligation to pray for every good Man departed. It is certain, he no where intimates, that it is an indispensable Duty to recommend all that die in a State of Grace at the Eucharistick Service. This is our present Controversy, and what ever Proof comes short of this, I think, is nothing to the purpose. And therefore after all we may safely conclude, that *St. Ambrose* is no Evidence against the Church of *England*.

Epiphanius was brought in by the Author of the *Reasons* (d), as making the rejecting Prayers for the Dead part of *Aërius's* Heresy. To this it was replied, That this Father puts some things into the List of Heresies which have no relation at all to the Fundamentals of Christianity; and that if his Book was to be the Standard of Heresy, the Author of the *Reasons* would find it a difficult matter to come off *Scotfree* (e). Here this Writer leaves his Patron unguarded, and asks, *Whether Epiphanius was in the wrong in so doing. Doth he, (meaning the Author of the No Necessity) think the groundless Limitation of Heresy, by the Modern Age to Fundamentals, is to be receiv'd in opposition to a primitive Writer? Every Immoral and Antichristian Doctrine is Heretical. To teach the Lawfulness of Murder, or to preach up Adultery, &c. are so many Branches of Heresy.*

What this Writer designs by this Jargon, I can't easily guess; unless he pretends to deny that the Principles of Morality have no relation to the Fundamentals of Christianity. *Ἀρεσις*, or *Heresy*, is a Word of a very extensive Signification, and has been us'd by prophane and Ecclesiastical Writers in quite different Senses, as plainly appears from every Lexicographer (f), or any other Author of Reputation. If the Author of the *Reasons* meant the Word in a candid Sense, where then lies the Force of his Argument? It was therefore supposed, that that ingenious Writer meant the Word, in the common Acceptation, as a
 Doctrine

(d) Page 15.

(e) No Necessity, Page 31.

(f) Vide *Ἀρεσις*, apud *Henric. Stephan. Thesaur.*

Doctrines contrary to some Fundamental Part of Christianity. Nay, it is plain he could mean nothing less than this; for *Aërius* was an *Arian*, and that Author ranks his rejecting Prayers for the Dead with his *Arianism*, when he tells us, that *Epiphanius* makes it a part of his Heresie. This Assertion indeed is something wide of that Father's Account of the Matter. For though he tells us, that *Aërius* was tinctur'd with *Arianism*, which we all own to be an Heresie in the harshest Signification of the Word; yet when he comes to speak of his rejecting Prayers for the Dead, he barely relates *Aërius's* Opinion and Arguments; and when he pretends to confute it, he doth not intimate as our Author insinuates; that it is a Denial of an Article of Faith. But it seems, if it could be prov'd, That *Epiphanius* did not make the rejecting this Office, Part of *Aërius's* Heresie; yet his Testimony is express to the Purpose of his Party, for he asserts not only the Lawfulness, but the Necessity of the Practice. That this Father thought Prayers for the Dead lawful, no body will deny, because he pretends to vindicate the Reasonableness and Usefulness of the Practice; but I can't find that he attempts to prove it an Essential or Necessary Part of Christianity. But after all, supposing this Father had stigmatiz'd the rejecting Prayers for the Dead as a damnable Heresie, and in the fullest Terms asserted the Necessity of them, even at the Holy Altar. Yet his Reputation is too inconsiderable to be any Damage to the Church of *England*, as I could easily prove from several Instances. However, I shall only set down the Character of the Man, as Mr. *Dupin* has justly describ'd it. " The Stile of *Epiphanius* (says he) is neither beautiful nor lofty: " On the contrary, it is plain, low, and mean, it is " rude and unpolish'd, without Coherence and Con- " nexion. He had much Reading and Learning, but " no faculty of Discerning, nor Exactness of Judg- " ment: He often uses such things for Reasons to re- " fute the Hereticks which are false: He was very cre- " dulous, and not very accurate: He is mistaken in " many places about very considerable Matters in Hi-

“ story, and gave credit too lightly to false Memoirs;
 “ or to uncertain Reports : He had much Zeal and
 “ Piety, but little Conduct and Policy (g).

St. Chrysostom and St. Austin were cited by the Author of the *Reasons*, as two good Authorities for Prayers for the Dead. Against the Sufficiency of their Authority in this Point, it was objected, that St. Chrysostom thought it lawful to pray for the Souls of wicked Men, and that our Prayers and Alms-giving would be very serviceable to them. And St. Austin was of Opinion, that it was unlawful to pray for a Martyr : For he reckon'd this was doing them an Injury. Now both these Opinions are supposed by this Answerer to be Mistakes. If therefore they were mistaken in one part of their Prayers relating to the Dead, it is no small Argument, that their Practice in the other part is no sufficient Authority to prove the Necessity of it. Here, it seems, it is thought fit to quit the Argument. *I have often observ'd*, says the Answerer of this Part, *that the private Sentiments of particular Fathers, how exceptionable soever, are no Argument against their Evidence. A Heathen may be a Man of Integrity, notwithstanding his Heathenism ; the Virtues of Morality are not confin'd to a right Perswasion, nor Sincerity inseparable from unerring Sentiments. Tho' St. Chrysostom might be mistaken in a particular Opinion. he cannot be charged with a Misrepresentation of Fact ; he might err in his Reasoning, when his Senses could not be deceiv'd.*

No body as I know of, concern'd in the Controversy, has given any harsh Name to these two eminent Fathers; and therefore I can't but wonder, why the REASONER should run so wide of his Argument, to shew what was never any part of our Dispute, that a Man might be in an Error, without being either a Knave or a Fool. When the two Fathers were cited, to what End was the Opinion of the one, and the Practice of the other urg'd. I thought their Authority was one of the Reasons for the Necessity of

(g) Dupin's Ecclesiast. Histor.

of restoring Prayers for the Dead. For if it was not, for my own part I can see nothing like a Reason in all the whole Book.

This Gentleman goes on : *St. Chrysostom must know what was the Practice of the Church, being in the highest Station of it, and this, he declares, was to pray for the Dead, as well as the Living; But doth he so much as intimate that it was the Custom of the Church to offer for Sinners? Or doth he deliver it as any other than his own Opinion?*

That *St. Chrysostom* knew what was the Practice of every Church in the World, is more than is probable; and that he declares, that it was to pray for the Dead as well as the Living, I must beg leave to call a Mistake: For all that the Father says in the cited Passage which relates to the Dead is this. *What sort of a Person ought he to be who intercedes for the whole City? But why do I say the City? he is a Mediator even for the whole Universe, and an Intercessor with God, that he may be propitious to the Sins of all Men, not only the Living, but likewise the Dead* (b). This indeed is an Argument, that it was the common Practice of his Patriarchate, but it comes vastly short of a Declaration, that it was the Practice of the whole Church. And to come a little closer to this Writer, *St. Chrysostom* intimates in this very Place, that it was the Practice of his Church to pray for Sinners, and consequently he did not, as this Gentleman says, deliver it as his own private Opinion. To conclude, neither *St. Chrysostom* nor *St. Austin* intimate, that Prayers for the Dead are an essential Part of the Christian Worship. They don't derive the Custom from a Divine Command; and therefore they are no Evidences against the Church of England. Both of them differ'd in their Principles and Practices about the Persons who were to be pray'd for, and therefore their Authority in this Point is too weak to do us any Harm.

Another Reason offer'd for the Necessity of altering our Common-Prayer was, because *in the Greek Liturgies,*

(b) De Sacerdot. Lib. 6.

Liturgies, the Gallican and Mosarabick Missals, and the Ordo Romanus, we meet with Prayers for the Dead. Here it was objected, that this Argument is as strong for some other Customs that were not pleaded for. For if the Authority of these Liturgies is sufficient to warrant one Practice against the Orders and Directions of the Church of *England*; Why not every Practice (i) in which they all agree? To this indeed there is a very surprizing Answer. Our *Dispute*, says this Writer, is concerning an Article of Faith, an Essential Part of the Christian Worship, the Communion of Saints: Unless therefore his Instances are of the same necessary Concern with this, of the same Obligation and Essentiality, his Argument (meaning the Author of the *No Necessity*) will fall short of Conviction, and his Objection will lose its Force. Without doubt this is a modest Reply, and pat to the purpose. The Controversy, it seems, has been, whether an Article of Faith, and an Essential Part of the Christian Worship, be necessary? But where this Dispute has been managed, I can't tell; and I am sure he won't find any sincere Members of the Church of *England*, that will dispute it with him. The Question, 'till this Disputant came, was, *whether Prayers for the Dead are necessary?* Which is very wide of what he dreams of. And one of the Reasons given for the Affirmative was, *because they were to be met with in most Missals*; which indeed is an Argument so weak, that it will scarce bear two Syllogisms. For if every thing that is in these Liturgies is not necessary, then I think the Argument must necessarily expire.

This Writer takes a great deal of Pains to prove his Patron doth not believe Purgatory. Without doubt, that Gentleman had a Reason for disliking the Name, but it is pretty plain he likes the Thing, and Designs no less by it than the Council of *Trent* requir'd (k).
For

(i) *Incense, aqua Benedicta, oleum Benedictum, for various Uses: Various Benedictions, Applications to the Merits and Intercession of the Virgin Mary, &c.*

(k) Vide Concil Trident de Purgatorio sess, 25.

For Refreshment, Mercy, Favour, Peace, and such like Expressions, which we find in his Book, naturally suppose a *State of Uneasiness or Torment*. And this is the very same thing that the best Part of the Papists mean by Purgatory (l). I am sorry to say that it is too plain that that Gentleman has pav'd the Way to the Mass, and that his Arguments have so convinced many of *Purgatory*, that they have gone over to *Poper*y.

At present I shall not concern my self, whether Prayers for the Dead are warrantable, or whether the Church of *England* doth any ways countenance any Part of the Practice. For it is sufficient to our purpose, that they are fully prov'd not to be necessary, or essential to Christianity.

The third Branch of this Controversy, says this Writer, is the *Invocation of the Holy Ghost, to make the Elements of Bread and mix'd Wine, the Spiritual and Energetical Body and Blood of Christ. To the Lawfulness of this Practice, the Answerer has nothing to object*. Here this Writer has very much alter'd the State of the Controversy; and consequently he is a little too rash in saying, that the Author of the *No Necessity* owns the Practice of his Party to be lawful in this Point. The Author of the *Reasons* (m) and *Defence* (n) pleaded for the restoring of the Prayer, as it stood in the first reformed Liturgy. *Hear us (O merciful Father) we beseech thee, and with thy Holy Spirit and Word, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy Gifts and Creatures of Bread and Wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy most dearly beloved Son, Jesus Christ*. This Prayer, it seems, can't content all his Party; and therefore in their New Communion-Office, they have compos'd a Form, which smells very rank of *Transubstantiation*. *Send down thine Holy Spirit, the Witness of the Passion of our Lord Jesus, upon this Sacrifice, that*
be

(l) Vide Leo. Allatium de Perpetuâ Consension, Lib. 3. Cap. 15. Renaudotij Observationes in Liturg. Syriac. Tom. 2. p. 107.

(m) *Reasons*, p. 22.

(n) *Defence*, p. 101.

he may make this Bread the Body of thy Christ, and this Cup the Blood of thy Christ. Now I can assure this Writer, that the Author of the *No Necessity* thinks Transubstantiation a pernicious Doctrine; and therefore he can't think that Practice lawful, which so evidently encourages the Notion. The Expressions are something stronger than the Canon of the Mass itself, such as the warmest Defenders of Transubstantiation can't but be pleas'd withal. And to speak my Mind freely, I have too much Reason to think, that some which use it, will scarce subscribe against that Doctrine.

It was own'd, that the Prayers in King *Edward's* Liturgy was lawful. But what Reason this Writer has to boast of this Concession I can't tell. For I hope I need not inform him that every good Prayer which we meet with in an old Liturgy, is not necessary. The Question is not, whether the *Invocation of the Holy Ghost upon the Elements* be lawful, but whether it is necessary? The Author of the *Reasons* (o) told us, that he was willing to believe the Force of the *INVOCATION* may be contain'd by *IMPLICATION* in our *PRESENT OFFICE*; which Concession, as the Learned Author of the *No Reasons* observes, is a plain Acknowledgment, that nothing for Restoring King *Edward's* Prayer can be pleaded, but Expediency. However, it seems the Prayer is not thought satisfactory (p); and the same Gentleman is now afraid that the Omission of the Invoking Part are maiming Circumstances, and may weaken the Benefit of the Sacrament (q): And this Writer insists upon the absolute Necessity of it. We will therefore shew, that each of these Suggestions are groundless and unreasonable.

It was said, by the Author of the *No Necessity*, ' That there were three Things requisite to make the Prayer pleaded for, necessary: Either a Positive Command, or

(o) Vid. p. 25.

(p) Defence, p. 130.

(q) Vindication of the Reasons and Defence,

or an early and plain Tradition, or a Demonstration, that this Form, or some Prayer like it, is necessary in the Nature of the Thing'. *This Demand, says this Writer, has been over and above answered by the Learned Author of the Defence, who has produc'd a Positive Command for it.*

Here I must tell this Writer, that he is a little too POSITIVE ; For that Gentleman only pretends, that there is a Command implied in these Words, εὐλογήσας καὶ ἐχαριστήσας, *having blessed, and given Thanks.* He doth not produce one Text of Scripture that looks like a Command to pray for the Descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Elements ; nor will, what he hath said, amount to any thing like a Proof of the Necessity of using the Expressions contended for. That Gentleman indeed tells us, *that our Saviour bless'd the Bread and the Cup : And that blessing the Elements, is in other Words, a Praying for the Descent of the Holy Ghost ; and that what our Saviour did, he commanded his Disciples to do.* This, were it true, is far from a Positive Command, to pray in so many Words for the Descent of the Holy Ghost. And all that his Argument can tend to, is only to prove, that we are oblig'd, by Virtue of our Saviour's Command, to consecrate the Elements ; and this that Gentleman is pleas'd to own the Church of *England* doth.

That τὸ εὐλογεῖν καὶ εὐχαρισεῖν, *to bless and give Thanks*, doth not signify a Praying for the Descent of the Holy Ghost, was prov'd by the Author of the *No Necessity*. For if this will hold, then every time we say Grace, we are to pray for the Descent of the Holy Ghost, upon our Viſuals : And our Saviour, when he bleſs'd the Loaves and Fiſhes, pray'd for the Descent of the Holy Ghost upon them. λαβὼν τὰς ἐπὶ τῷ ἄρτους εὐχαριστίας ἔκλυσεν, — ἰχθύνια θλίξα καὶ εὐλογήσας (r), To this it is objected, that τὸ εὐλογεῖν *to BLESS* has various Significations ; and that the difference of the Action ſhews the difference of the Term. And what then? Is not the

Action the same here, tho' the Subjects be different? Doth not St. *Luke* (s), and St. *Paul* (t) interpret εὐλογίας by εὐχαριστίας, *having given Thanks*. And besides this, when we bless God or Man, Is this a Praying for the Descent of the Holy Ghost upon them? And when the Priest, under the Old Law, bless'd the Sacrifice, was he suppos'd to invoke the Descent of the Holy Ghost then? In short, let us take the Word in all the Significations, in which any Author whatsoever has us'd it. We shall find none of them come up to the Design of this Writer's Party, as has been tully demonstrated by the Judicious and Learned Author of the *No Sufficient Reasons* (u).

Our Author pretends that there is an early and plain Tradition for this Form. The first Authority produc'd for it, are the *Liturgies of St. James, St. Mark, St. Peter, and the Apostolical Constitutions*. To this it was objected, that every one of these Missals are spurious, that several of the Prayers that are in them, can claim no higher *Æra* than the Fourth Century, and that it is possible this might be inserted as late as any. Here our Author says, that his Patron *has offer'd some Reasons from BISHOP WAKE, to shew that this Part of them was the PRESCRIPTION of the Apostles and Evangelists*. This, I think, needs no other Answer, than that Learned Prelate's own Words, which are these: *As for the Liturgies ascrib'd to St. Peter, St. Mark, and St. James; there is not, I suppose, any Learned Man, who believes them written by those Holy Men* (x). Besides, I might observe, that the Archbishop's Practice is no small Evidence, that he believes these Prayers are not genuine,

(s) He took Bread, and gave Thanks, and brake it, &c. He took the Cup, and gave Thanks, and said, Take this, Luke 22.

(t) For I have received of the Lord, that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, in the same Night in which he was betray'd, took Bread, and when he had given Thanks he brake it; 1 Cor. 11.23, &c.

(u) *No sufficient Reasons*, p. 86, &c.

(x) Vide Bishop Wake's Preface to his Translation of the Apostolical Fathers.

genuine, or at leastwise not obliging or necessary. But after all, supposing these Missals to be genuine, yet I can't see how they can serve the Purpose of our Author's Party; unless every Prayer which is contain'd in them can be prov'd to be necessary. In the best reputed Editions of St. Peter's Liturgy, there is no Prayer for the Descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Oblata. The other have a vast difference in their Forms, and not one of them give us the least hint that such a Prayer as our Author demands, is necessary or essential.

And when we come to the Fathers, we find nothing like a Tradition for the Necessity of such a Form. St. Basil indeed is cited for this Purpose, and our Author fancies him a positive Evidence for it: But what Reason he has for to think so, he can't tell. For when St. Basil's Testimony is produc'd, we shall find he doth not so much as say one Word of the Matter. *What Saint* (says this Father) *has left us in Writing the Words of Invocation, when we consecrate the Bread of the Eucharist, and the Cup of Blessing* (y). Now is here any thing that looks like a Tradition, for the Necessity of a Prayer for the Descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Elements? Nay, is there so much as the least Mention of the Holy Ghost in any Part of the Passage? I am perswaded the *Author of the Reasons* was the first that ever made this Comment upon this Place: And it is plain enough, that this Writer and his Assistants can't defend it, by requiring some other Interpretation to be given of it. To satisfy then this Writer, τὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως ῥήματα. *The Words of Invocation* signifie the Communion-Office, or Words which we make use of when we call upon God at the Eucharistick Service. Or to use the Words of Monsieur *Renaudaut* (z). Basil here calls the (Canon of the

I 2

Mass,

(y) Τὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως ῥήματα ἐστὶ τῇ ἀναδείξει τῶ ἀγίου τῆς εὐχαριστίας, καὶ τῆς ποτίσεως τῆς εὐλογίας, πρὸς τὸν ἅγιον ἐγγράφως ἡμῶν καταλέλοιπεν. Ad Amphiloc. Cap. 27.

(z) Invocationem Vocat Bisilius, Canonem Missæ: Quia multis ἐπικλήσι, seu Invocationibus Constat. Renaudot. Dissert. de Liturg. Orient. Tom. 1. Cap. 2. Pag. 9.

Mass, or) Communion-Office Invocation, because it consists of many Invocations. In short, all that St. Basil means in the forecited Passage is only this : That before his Time none of the Greek Liturgies, or at least no Form of Consecration was committed to Writing, which by the way is no mean Evidence against the Legitimacy of the Apostolical Liturgies. However, it seems, if St. Basil's Evidence is not sufficient, the Testimony of St. Cyril his Contemporary will, put the Matter beyond Dispute. He expressly informs us, that the Eucharistick Bread is made the Body of Christ, μετὰ τὴν ἐπικλήσιν, which our Author construes B T (instead of A F T E R) the Invocation of the Holy Ghost.

What St. Cyril means by ἐπικλήσις, is very plain from several Passages where the Word is us'd by him ; and more particularly from this, upon the very same Purpose. *As the Bread and Wine of the Eucharist (says this Father,) before the HOLT INVOCATION OF THE ADORABLE TRINITY, was common Bread and common Wine, so after the Invocation is over, the BREAD is made the Body of Christ and the WINE the Blood of Christ (a). And in another Place. As the Meats that are offer'd upon the Altar, tho' pure in their Nature become polluted τῇ ἐπικλήσει, by THE INVOCATION OF IDOLS, so common Water upon the Invocation of the Holy Spirit and Christ becomes holy (b). And in some other Places, the same Father calls several Prayers, which don't any ways relate to the Sacrament, INVOCATION.*

Our Author goes on, *Justin Martyr, and Irenæus, Origen and St. Cyril, Optatus and St. Basil, St. Gregory Nyssen and St. Chrysostom, all of them are Witnesses to this Apostolical Custom, the earliest and purest Ages of Christianity, the whole Interval between Forty Years after the Death of St. John, and the Decline of the fourth Century.*

(a) "Ὁσπερ γὰρ ὁ ἄρτος, &c. μετὰ τὴν ἀγίαν ἐπικλήσιν τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος Τριᾶδος, ἄρτος ἦν, &c. ἐπικλήσιν τὴν λεγομένην, ὁ μὲν ἄρτος γίνεται σῶμα, &c. Catech. Mystagog. I. Sect. 4.

(b) Cyril Carachef. 3. Sect. 2.

Century. And is not this sufficient, (says this Writer) to answer our Author's Question, Is the Sacrament invalid without this Form ? To this I answer, No, no more than if this modest Writer, had cited so many Names out of the first Chapter of St. Matthew. For I believe I need not prove, that not one of them knew of the Form, which was pleaded for by the Author of the Reasons, and I can inform him, that they don't make the least Intimation of an Apostolical Tradition, for the Necessity of praying for the Descent of the Holy Ghost upon the sacred Elements. But to draw towards a Conclusion.

Has this Writer prov'd the Prayer for the Descent of the Holy Ghost necessary, from the Reason of the Thing? No, This is not so much as attempted, and therefore since there is no Scripture, nor Tradition, for the Necessity of such a Form, as is demanded, and the Nature of the Thing don't require it ; I think I may safely quit this Head, without taking any further Notice, of the loose and trifling Cavils of this Writer.

To come then to the Oblatory Prayer. It seems the Author of the No Necessity said, that the last thing which AS YET is demanded, is, the Restoration of the Oblatory Prayer. Here this Gentleman, is pleas'd to take Pique at the Word YET. But why AS YET ? (says he,) Is he really of Opinion, that the Modern Age hath deviated further from the Antient Church, than is express'd in the Charge ? Or doth he think them less Primitive than AS YET they have been believ'd. To deal plainly then with this Writer ; We can't tell what Extravagancies, a Spirit of Enthusiasm and Division may drive Men to: Mr. Stephens's Case will justify our Jealousy, especially when we consider how many are acted by the same Temper. We know that there were a great many antient Customs, which the modern Age with very great Reason refuse. The Circumstances of Time and Place, make a great many Alterations, and what might be decent and proper in one Country and Age, may be ridiculous and impertinent in another. But yet as improper or impertinent

as the Things may really appear; Who knows, but some giddy Men may like them: And if they once warm their Fancy, we don't doubt, but they will be talkt of as expedient, if not pleaded for as necessary. That the Suggestion is not groundless, is too plain, from the new Communion-Office, publish'd since the Writing of the *No Necessity*.

Besides Chrisin, there are some other Things not pleaded for *then*, inserted in that Pamphlet. Without doubt they are thought lawful and useful, and whatever is so, this Writer has more than once told us must be necessary.

However, says this Author, *I believe he is by this time satisfied with the Extent of our Demand*. Yes; doubtless, but why I can't tell: For at first, the Demands seem'd a little modest, only a few Alterations of our Common Prayer, then we had *Reasons for restoring some Prayers of King Edward's Liturgy*: And now I suppose it is demanded to comply with this new Service-Book. For I can't believe, but those Gentlemen, who thought they had a right to compile a new Office, suppose they have Authority to enjoin Uniformity. After all, I shall only ask this Writer, whether auricular Confession &c. has not been demanded: So that God knows where the Demands of some will end.

But to return to the Question about the *Oblatory Prayer*. The Author of the *No Necessity* said, That he had no Objection against what this Writer's Patron call'd the *Oblatory Prayer of King Edward's Liturgy*. But then says he, I can't tell, why this Form should be so strenuously insisted on at this Time, for the Notion of a Sacrifice don't infer the Necessity of such a Prayer. For Answer to this, our Author refers us to the learned Mr. *Johnson*, Author of the *Unbloody Sacrifice* (c). And all the Reply I think I need to make to this, is, That Mr. *Johnson* has not quitted the Communion of the *Church of England*. However
to

to do that worthy Gentleman Justice, we shall give the Reader his own Words upon the very same Case. *Tho' I am fully convinc'd, (says Mr. Johnson) that the Eucharist may be as justly call'd a Sacrifice, as any, save that offer'd on the Cross, yet I can see NO NECESSITY for any Alteration (d).*

It was said by the Author of the *No Necessity*, That it is plain, our Saviour gave the Sacrament to his Disciples, without making use of such a Prayer as this. In answer to which, this Writer says, *He must observe that the holy Scriptures inform us, that our Lord blessed the Bread, that the learned Author of the Defence has prov'd from Numb. 6. 24. That Blessing in the Scripture Language is praying for a Blessing; and that in the most ancient Liturgy in the World, the Oblation and Invocation are one continued Prayer: From whence (says he,) we may very probably conclude, that the Prayer of Oblation is contain'd in the WORD ΕΥΛΟΓΙΑΣ or BLESSING, and consequently that our Saviour, when he gave the Sacrament to his Disciples, did make use of such a Prayer.*

ΕΥΛΟΓΙΑΣ, it seems is a very strange Word, it signifies, not only a Prayer for the Descent of the Holy Ghost, but likewise a Prayer of Oblation. But suppose the Word was never us'd, to signify one or the other; What then becomes of our Author's Probability? And if we may believe St. Paul, it is plain, the Word doth not signify any such Thing, for he tells us what our Saviour did at his last Supper. *I have received of the Lord (says this Apostle,) that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus the same Night in which he was betrayed, took Bread, and when he had GIVEN THANKS, HE BROKE IT, and said, Take eat, this is my Body which is broken for you, Do this in Remembrance of me (e).* Now, if giving of Thanks and Breaking of Bread, (both which the Church of England practice) do not necessarily imply a Prayer of Oblation, then it is plain, that our Saviour
when

(d) *Mr. Johnson's Preface to the Second Part of the Vade Mecum*

(e) 1 Cor. 11, 23, &c.

when he gave the Sacrament, did not make use of such a Prayer. As for the Liturgy (f), which our Author brings in by Head and Shoulders, I think I need not prove, that our Saviour did not make use of it, and consequently it can be no Proof of our Saviour's Practice in this Point.

It was further ask'd, Hath any of the Apostles, since the Death of our Saviour, left us a Command to make use of such a Prayer? To this *material Question*, our Author thinks fit to make no Reply. However, tho' the Scripture don't serve his Purpose, yet it seems we have an early Tradition for it. *Justin Martyr says, when the Priest has finish'd the Prayers and the Eucharist, the People say A M E N.* And pray what is this to the Oblatory Prayer? Doth he here say any thing more, than what is the constant Practice of the Church of *England*? Hath our Author forgot, that when our Priest has ended the Prayer or *Thanksgiving*, (for so what he translates *Eucharist* signifies,) the People are enjoind to say *A M E N* (g)? The other Father which is cited is *St. Cyprian. In Sacrificiis precem cum pluribus facimus.* We pray at our Sacrifices with the Assembly. This very learned Writer, might as well have cited this Text for the *Invalidity of Lay Baptism*; as the *Necessity of an Oblatory Prayer*. For I believe every body will own the Passage, as plain a Tradition for the one as the other: Besides will this Gentleman say, that the *Church of England* Priests don't pray with the Assembly at the Celebration of the *Eucharistick Sacrifice*?

The next Argument which this Writer brings, is so muddy that I cannot easily guess at it. "Both this Father, says he, (meaning *St. Cyprian*) and *Tertulian*, when they relate the Custom of mentioning the Names of the Deceased in the Eucharistical Oblation, as has been before shew'd, do, beyond Contradiction,

(f) I suppose our Author means, what is commonly call'd the *Clementine Liturgy*, which was never us'd by any Church that we know of; and differs very much in this Part, from almost all others whatever.

(g) Vide Rubrick after the Absolution.

“ tradition, testify the Practice of offering the Chri-
 “ stian Sacrifice by Prayer. For how could they
 “ mention their Names at the Oblation, as *St. Cyprian*
 “ speaks, offer for particular Persons, as *Tertullian*
 “ informs us, if there was no Prayer of Oblation.
 “ To recommend the Dead at the Eucharistick Sacri-
 “ fice, is to pray for them in Virtue of that Sacrifice,
 “ and to enumerate the Particulars of the Institution,
 “ is, to offer the Sacrifice by Prayer.

Whatever our Author designs here, it can do him
 no Service; for it has been plainly prov'd, that Pray-
 ers for the Dead are not necessary. Besides, I think
 this Writer doth not, *as yet*, insist upon the Necessity
 of reciting the Names of his deceased Friends in the
Eucharistical Oblation. And if this is not necessary,
 then I think it is plain, that the accidental Consequen-
 ces of an indifferent Practice can make no Argument
 for him.

But after all, this Writer thinks he gives a home Push
 to the Author of the *No Necessity*. If an Oblatory Prayer
 (says he) should be granted an unnecessary Circumstance of
 the Eucharistical Celebration, the Force of the Objection
 would not yet be remov'd. And pray why? Why, it seems,
 the Author of the *No Necessity* acknowledges the Doctrine
 of the Sacrifice, and he has not attempted to prove, that
 the Alterers of the Liturgy believ'd the Eucharist
 to be a Sacrifice. And what then? Doth it follow,
 that that Author must either quit his Notion, or dis-
 own the first Reformers? Hath he not prov'd, that
 the Notion of a Sacrifice don't require such a Prayer
 as is demanded? Did the Learned *Joseph Mead* and
Dr. Hicks, who look'd as far into the Case as any that
 pretend to be so scrupulous now, make it a Term of
 Communion? And has the Learned Mr. *Johnson*, who
 has wrote so much upon the Argument, quitted the
 Church of *England*? These good Men were willing
 to throw a Veil over the little Defects of some who
 were among the first Reformers. It is possible, the
 Zeal of that Time against the Superstitions and Abu-
 ses in the Sacrifice of the Mass might lead them into
 some little Mistakes. And who is without them?

Or it may be they might politickly discountenance the Word *Sacrifice*, for no other End than to take away the Occasion of those Abuses that had crept into the Church through it. But is this any argument that they denied any essential Part of the Sacrament, or that their Communion was not defensible. For my own part, I won't quarrel with any one for calling the Eucharistical *Sacrifice* by the Name of the *Sacrament*, or the Lord's Supper, &c. A Man may be a good Christian, tho' he don't understand the Subtleties of the School-men; he may be a worthy Communicant, tho' unacquainted with the Opinions of the Fathers; and a true Disciple of Christ, tho' altogether unskill'd in the Jewish or Gentile Theology. 'Tis no great matter what Name the Sacrament is called by, so long as the Death and Passion of our Saviour is truly commemorated, and what our Great Master commanded is effectually perform'd at it: For Religion doth not consist in Words, but Things. 'Tis sufficient to say, that our pious Reformers perform'd whatsoever our Lord commanded them to do in Remembrance of him. And therefore should we suppose the main Body of the People at that Time ignorant of the true Notion of the Word *Sacrifice*, and that some who had the chief hand in the Reformation were mistaken in condescending to the Weakness of those, who out of Abhorrence to the Popish Superstitions and Abuses, desir'd a significant Word to be laid aside. Yet this is no argument that we should disown the Reformation. However, after all, supposing the Mistakes of our Reformers were more substantial, than ever yet could be prov'd, supposing these great and good Men were altogether indefensible in this Point. Yet I can't see how their suppos'd Defects in this matter, can affect the present State of the Church of *England*. For whatever Discouragements the Notion of a Christian Sacrifice might meet with at the beginning of the Reformation; yet it is evident, that the Alterations which have been long since made in our Common-Prayer-Book, countenance the Thing. Doth not the Church of *England* call her Presbyters, *Priests*, and the

the Communion-Table, an *Altar*? Both which Names necessarily suppose a Sacrifice. Hath she not taken care that none but those who are admitted into the Priestly Order shall celebrate the Eucharistick Service? And, to say no more, hath she ever since the Revival of her Common-Prayer discountenanc'd any of her worthy Members, who have strenuously maintain'd what our Author calls *The Doctrine of the Sacrifice*. So that upon the whole I think I may safely say, that the Author of the *No Necessity* may comfortably continue in the Communion of the Church of *England*, without acting inconsistently with his Notion. But after all, supposing that the Notion of a Sacrifice did require a second Oblation, yet I can't but think with the Learned Mr. *Johnson*, that the Consecration-Prayer, and the Words us'd by the Priest at the Administration are sufficient (b). Nay, to go further, Did I think the present Service too lame and defective, and unsatisfactory in this Point; yet then I should think it my Duty, rather to supply what I thought defective or unsatisfactory, by my silent Devotions, than to disturb the Quiet of the Church.

(b) Vide Mr. Johnson's Preface to the Second Part of the *Vade Mecum*.

F I N I S.



